The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1901.

The Week.

A mythical, peripatetic Cuban republic our Imperialists were all wild to recognize any time from 1896 to 1898. Its famed capital, Cubitas, does not now figure in our own United States census of Cuba, though this covers the very smallest towns and aldeas. The Cuban republic of those days was an entity up a tree, or on a mule's back; *we* had scruples—unpatriotic, of course—about recognizing it. The Imperialists would have recognized it out of hand, though they could not even see it. Well, now we have an actual Cuban republic in the making, certified to by our own Military Governor as the product of a people "now ready to proceed to the establishment of a general government which shall assume and exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, and control over the island." One would have expected the Imperialists to fall over each other with enthusiasm in recognizing such a Cuban republic. But no; they begin to mutter strange suspicions about a "mob in Havana," about the "good Cubans," the "real Cubans," not wanting a republic, and so on. Any one can see how impossible it is to please such inconstant minds. We fear that we shall have to give up trying.

What is the use of all this beating about the bush to find reasons for not keeping our promise to Cuba? She is too weak to force us to observe good faith, and that ought to be sufficient. To wriggle and squirm in order to make out some semblance of justification for perjuring ourselves will only land us in such contradictions as mark the floundering of the *Tribune*. We reproduce in parallel columns what it said about the Teller resolution on April 19, 1898, and what it said about it on February 6, 1901:

"The resolutions may not be the best that human wisdom could have devised, and they may not altogether please everybody. . . . Now that they are at last enacted, they will be accepted and supported *loyally by all the people, as an essential and highly important part of the law of the land.*"—*Tribune*, April 19, 1898.

"If, then, the Teller resolution respecting Cuban independence were an error, it would be neither *wise nor just to persist in maintaining it.* The course of prudence and honor would lie in frankly admitting the error, and in atoning for it by doing now the thing which should have been done at the outset."—*Tribune*, February 6, 1901.

Standing in the centre of the Republican side of the House of Representatives on Saturday, Mr. Brown of Ohio boldly condemned the Philippine policy of the Administration. According to the report in the New York *Tribune*, many Republican Congressmen congratulated him at the close of his speech. Very many of the members of the party throughout the country will openly applaud his course; very many more will in their hearts approve it. The resolution proposed by Mr. Brown declares it to be the purpose of the United States, in retaining possession of the Philippine Islands, to aid the inhabitants, when they submit to the authority of the United States, in establishing a free government, and, when that has been accomplished, to relinquish authority in those islands. Mr. Brown urged that, in all fairness, this purpose should be at once declared. He pleaded earnestly against a colonial policy, as violating principles which we have cherished as the very life of free government. He pointed out that Congress has never yet announced to the Filipinos what this nation proposes to do with them. The President has demanded unconditional surrender; Congress, urged Mr. Brown, should promise them freedom. As a party measure, he contended, such a promise would be expedient. The moment is opportune. Our Government is strong enough to make the declaration without having its motives questioned by friend or foe. To continue our present course is, to apply the language used by Mr. Brown in reference to breaking our promise to the Cubans, "the climax of greed, without one spark of conscience. It is the acme of avarice, without a single redeeming feature. It is the doctrine of a freebooter of the world. It is the code of a pirate of all the seas."

Congressman Babcock of Wisconsin has introduced a bill to repeal all duties on iron and steel and their products except a few specialties of a highly finished character. Mr. Babcock is Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee and a member of the Committee of Ways and Means. He has been moved to take this step by the proposed steel combination of which the newspapers have been full during the past week or two, and which is now evidently approaching completion. Mr. Babcock is quoted in a newspaper interview as saying that he believes that this is the only relief Congress can give to consumers from the exactions of the combination, that he has consulted a great many members of Congress in reference to his bill, that they have all agreed with him, and that he believes it will receive the support of nine-tenths of the members of the House. He does not expect it to pass at this session, however, the remaining time being so short. He adds:

"My bill does not touch raw iron ore, nor does it touch manufactured goods in which the labor is the greater part of the product. It takes the duty off items in schedule C of the Dingley Tariff Act, such as structural iron, steel billets, steel rails, and wire-rods. The tariffs on most of these articles have been changed from time to time to foster and build up infant industries. These infant industries have become now one of the most colossal combinations in the country. This legislation is directly in line with Republican efforts to control Trusts at the last session of Congress, and has the endorsement of members of the National Republican Committee."

Question may be raised as to the details of Mr. Babcock's bill, especially the clause omitting iron ore. It is not likely that Congress will pass, or the country sanction, a measure which puts a duty on the raw material of an industry while admitting the finished product free. That is a side issue, however. It is a matter of immense significance that an attack upon the tariff has started in an influential Republican quarter. Here we may hopefully look for relief from the more than mediæval policy embodied in the Dingley act. Nor could we expect real relief from any other quarter. The Democrats are too much disorganized by differences on the money question, on Bryanism and Populism, to make any effective movement for tariff reform. But when the Republicans make such a movement it will be irresistible. The combinations will not be able to offer any effective opposition to the Babcock bill; and if this one passes, others will follow until every monopolized article is placed on the free list. How much effect this movement may have on the prices of the articles in the domestic market can be learned only by experiment. The steel combine, and all the rest of them, will charge the highest prices they can get, both at home and abroad. This is the law of trade. They habitually sell at lower rates in Europe than in America, being enabled to do so by the tariff. It is no new phenomenon. It was done by the producers of copper thirty years ago, and the tariff was arranged with full knowledge that they might do so. That system must come to an end, and the end will come soon if Chairman Babcock is in earnest in pushing his bill. The need of any protective duties on iron and steel passed away long ago.

The Democratic Senators are to be commended for the vigor and spirit they have thrown into the anti-subsidy fight, so that, with the assistance of eight or ten Republicans, they have forced the abandonment of night sessions. Senator Jones of Arkansas gave notice that he and his friends would fight the bill day and night to the end of the session, and would require the supporters of it to have a quorum on hand all the time. Mr. Jones was ably seconded by Senators Teller, Clay, Bacon, Turner, and Berry. A good deal of talking was done by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republicans also, especially by Chandler and Nelson, who did not speak on the Subsidy Bill at all, but used up time and thus gave the avowed opponents of the measure a chance to rest. The remarks of Senator Aldrich during the same night session ought to encourage the Democrats to keep up the fight, and were perhaps intended to do so. "We understand perfectly well," he said, "that you can kill this bill. There is no question about that. If Senators sitting on the other side of the chamber desire to take the responsibility, they can kill every measure now before Congress under the rules of the Senate," etc. That was a notable hint: "Don't nail his ears to the pump." We presume that Senator Jones understood it. We hope that he and his colleagues will appreciate the situation, and see that here is an opportunity to pull themselves together and make their party strong once more by rendering a real service to the country —a service which the independent voters throughout the country will not fail to remember in the time to come.

The Chicago *Tribune* continues its collection and compilation of editorial opinions on the Ship-Subsidy Bill. The responses from Ohio are thirteen for the Hanna-Payne bill, and sixteen against it. The veteran T. F. Mack of the Sandusky *Register* writes that the bill is vicious in principle, and that it is not demanded by business conditions. He adds that it is not in harmony with the St. Louis platform. Turning to the latter document, we find that Mr. Mack is quite right. The St. Louis platform endorses discriminating duties in favor of American ships, the product of American labor employed in American shipyards, and has not a word in favor of subsidies. Nor does the Philadelphia platform of last year endorse the policy of subsidies. It says that "the national defence and naval efficiency of this country supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world." There is not a word here inconsistent with the St. Louis platform; therefore, the one must be interpreted in a way to harmonize with the other. That there was a conspiracy to set aside the policy of discriminating duties in favor of subsidies from the Treasury is quite probable. We all remember the splutter that Gen. Grosvenor had with our Mr. Quigg after the Philadelphia Convention adjourned. Grosvenor accused Quigg of altering this plank of the platform after it had been agreed upon by the Committee. He knew that this must be so because he (Grosvenor), although not a member of the Committee himself, had had the right plank in his hands, and, after submitting it to competent persons (probably Hanna, Frye, and Griscom), had handed it to the Chairman of the Committee (Senator Fairbanks) for insertion in the proper place. As the Grosvenor plank did not appear in the platform reported to the Convention, he naturally inferred that Quigg, as Secretary of the Committee, had burked it. Quigg replied that he had done nothing of the kind. He had reported accurately and truthfully the platform adopted by the Committee. Nor did Grosvenor ever find a member of the Committee to deny Quigg's statement. The quotations we have made from the two platforms seem to fully justify the statements made by Senators Allison and Spooner in their colloquy with Senator Morgan, that the Subsidy Bill is not a Republican party measure.

Senators Allison and Hale made some remarks last Thursday on the increase of the appropriation bills, which ought to arrest the attention of all thinking persons both in and out of Congress. Mr. Allison drew attention to the fact that the public expenses for the ensuing year would reach $780,000,000, being some $40,000,000 more than last year. Mr. Hale remarked that, a few years ago, everybody was shocked to find that the expenses had reached one billion dollars for a single Congress, lasting two years. It was evident, he said, that we were rapidly approaching a billion-dollar *session*. He pointed sorrowfully to the fact that our military budget for the coming year, including pensions, would reach $400,000,000, being double that of any European Power. The entire expenditures of the Government, including postal service, in 1892, were only $413,000,000, and now, after a lapse of only ten years, our expenditure for war purposes, *in time of peace*, nearly reaches that sum. The Pension Bill alone calls for $145,000,000, against $139,000,000 in 1899; and this takes place thirty-six years after the close of the civil war. It would seem as though the American republic was no longer capable of controlling itself. The two Senators who made these explanations are members of the Committee on Appropriations. They are at the head of the procession, yet they are not able to stop the movement. The crowd behind is pushing them to the edge of a precipice. "We have not found any place yet," said Mr. Hale, "where we could cut off anything."

Three of President McKinley's nominations of general officers on Tuesday week are utterly inexcusable from the army point of view, viz., those of Gen. Frederick Dent Grant, Dr. Leonard Wood, and Capt. J. Franklin Bell. Gen. Grant's sole claim to distinction is the fact that he is the son of his father. Graduated from West Point in 1871 (near the bottom of his class), he served on his father's and on Gen. Sherman's staff until 1881, when he returned to civil life. His work in the Philippines has been in no respect noteworthy, and such merit as it has had is due solely to efficient subordinates. His appointment is practically one from civil life, and places him over thousands of officers in every way better fitted in experience and training for the position. We do not believe that any other service in the world would reward an army doctor with the rank of a brigadier-general because of military duty comprising, in all, eight weeks in the command of a volunteer cavalry regiment. Whatever may have been Gen. Wood's services in Santiago and Cuba, they have been civilian, diplomatic, and administrative, and have in no way fitted him for the military position to which he is now appointed. This is the price paid by the President for Gen. Wood's declination of the office of President of the District of Columbia Railways. We have yet to hear of an officer who does not regard this advancement as a slap at the service, and a premium upon military ignorance and incapacity. Gen. Bell is at least a West Pointer, and an able and efficient soldier. The injustice in his case is that he is jumped over 1,032 officers of longer service, when a staff majority would have been sufficient reward. The advancement of these three men will outweigh in most army officers' eyes the excellence of the other selections.

Our tactful American way of requesting foreign Ministers to come to a public festivity, in order to celebrate the humiliation of their own people, was again gracefully exhibited in the cordial invitation to Wu Ting Fang to be present at the banquet in honor of Gen. Otis on Thursday night. That officer had, by military order, fixed a stigma upon the Chinese race. He had practically rated them as a less desirable class than the very Katipunan miscreants whom he was trying to kill in the Philippines. All this the organizers of the dinner to Gen. Otis had forgotten, or were willing to overlook, but Minister Wu neither had forgotten nor would he overlook. His polite letter of declination was so deft a rebuke of unconscious bad manners that its very recipients read it out in public without perceiving, apparently, that it was really in resentment of an insult. The affair recalls the equally gracious invitation to the Spanish Minister to go to Chicago on "Dewey Day," to take part in the public rejoicings over the slaughter of his countrymen. For inimitable *savoir-faire* this gave us a reputation so great that the incident of Thursday night cannot heighten it. It must be hard for a genial man like Minister Wu to be punctilious with such a naïve set; but he evidently considers it his duty to expound etiquette to us as well as Christianity.

By far the most interesting contribution to the discussion over last year's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British trade is contained in the searching analysis, made by the London *Economist*, of the question how much of the gain was due to larger quantities, and how much to increased values. In the matter of merchandise imports, results were clear enough. After deducting reëxports, there was a substantial increase both in quantity and in prices. Turning the *Economist's* values into American money, it appears that the imports of 1900, even if average prices had remained unchanged from the preceding year, would still have been worth $28,175,000 more than the total of 1899. With the higher prices—especially for cotton—actual value of the imports was of course immensely increased; the *Economist* estimates the enhancement on price account alone at $174,530,000. The fact remains, however, that the import trade of the year was much larger, not only in value but in quantity, and that the increase, reckoned by quantity alone, was twice as great as the increase of 1899 over 1898.

But the *Economist's* analyzed figures on the export trade bring a much more interesting conclusion. They prove not only that higher prices (notably of coal) are responsible for the $125,000,000 increase in 1900's exports, but that, without this rise in prices, Great Britain's outward trade last year would have shown heavy decrease. The *Economist's* figures prove that, if all the exports of 1900 had been sent out at the average values of a year before, there would have been a shrinkage for the year of no less than $80,000,000, as compared with a gain of $42,600,000, on the same basis of reckoning, during 1899. The result of the whole inquiry undertaken by the *Economist* is that, while on the face of the Board of Trade returns Great Britain's total over-sea trade last year increased $318,000,000, the whole of this gain and more was due to increased prices. At the valuations of the year before, the total foreign trade, imports and exports combined, would have fallen £16,484,000, or $82,420,000, below 1899.

Sir Edward Clarke, the brilliant lawyer and distinguished Conservative member of Parliament who broke with his party on the Boer war, now publicly blames Lord Roberts for demanding unconditional surrender when Gen. Botha asked for terms. All that has happened since—the prolongation of hostilities at such frightful cost of suffering and life on both sides—Sir Edward attributes to the lack of a policy of generous conciliation at that critical juncture. But, of course, this is only another way of blaming the Government. Gen. Roberts must have made the reply to Botha under instructions. It was then the rôle of Chamberlain to be very stern and unyielding, and to compel the Boers to surrender abjectly in order to make up for the humiliations they had inflicted upon him. Even now he announces that there will be no change of policy. The unsatisfactory conditions in South Africa threaten to become as "chronic" as Gen. MacArthur says they do in the Philippines, but, of course, the only thing for a powerful Government to do is to keep right on butting its head against a stone wall. Great men can afford to be conciliatory; it is only the little men trying to act as though they were great, who stand upon their dignity and make the country smart for their foolish pride of consistency.

Some striking comparisons are made by M. Jules Roche in an article in the Paris *Figaro* on population in the nineteenth century. There is little resemblance between the Europe of 1801 and the Europe of to-day. The names of the larger states are the same, but they describe very different entities. The population was 175,000,000 in 1801; it has increased to 392,000,000. The population of France in the former year, with its new and, as M. Roche patriotically calls them, natural frontiers, was 33,000,000; "superior in number, in cohesion, in vigor, to every other nation except Russia." Russia itself had but 36,000,000, mostly uncivilized. The United Kingdom had only 16,000,000. The old German Empire, which was then but a political expression, having crumbled before the arms of France, contained in its three hundred constituent states but 25,000,000 of inhabitants. Austria and Hungary had as many. There was no Italy; the kingdom of Sardinia had less than three millions, the States of the Church the same, the kingdom of Naples almost five millions, the grand duchy of Tuscany one million. France represented in itself one-fifth of Europe, and held in almost every respect the first place. On this side of the Atlantic, our country, with its five million inhabitants, was the only one whose population was known.

To a Frenchman the changes of the century are especially startling. France, with contracted limits, has but 38,000,000 of people. Even within these limits the population of 1801 was 26,000,000, so that the increase, at best, has been but 12,000,000. Instead of numbering the fifth part of Europe, the French are now but a tenth; England has 41,000,000 people; the new German Empire has 56,000,000; Austria has 45,000,000; Russia perhaps 135,000,000; even Italy has 32,000,000, and is increasing, while France is stationary. It is unnecessary to refer to the changes that have taken place in the Americas. A hundred years ago "active humanity" numbered less than 200,000,000, of whom the French were one-sixth, and in every way powerful and pre-eminent. Now the progressive peoples number 800,000,000, and it is not only in numbers that the French are surpassed. Nevertheless, in the "real superiorities" the French people are not backward. As M. Roche concludes, the subjugation of the forces of nature, to which the increase in human population is due, owes nothing to arms, to Emperors, to legislatures, to governments. The true potentates have been the men of inventive genius, of devotion to science, whose discoveries and whose energies have renovated the earth, and knit its remote parts together. They have made greater changes than "all the princes, all the conquests, all the foundations, and all the falls of kingdoms and empires." In this noble domain of ideas, mere numbers do not count, and France, "si elle sait penser," may again take the first place. Certainly the first step toward regaining her lost position will be to recognize the truth of this maxim, which involves the abandonment of military glory as an ideal.

Not that the Italian Ministry has fallen, but that it has stood so long, is surprising; and now that the expected has happened, and Signor Saracco and his colleagues are actually out, it is chiefly the manner of their expulsion that is interesting. Like that of his predecessor, Pelloux, Saracco's fall is due to labor troubles. Everything comes back to that in Italy. His resignation, however, was caused by no vigorous policy of his own, but by a mere parliamentary accident. His Government, since the assembling of Parliament, had gone slowly and cautiously along the way of opportunism, until an alarming strike at Genoa forced it to take a resolute position. It appeared that the strike, like the bread riots of three years ago, was chiefly political, and fomented by the Socialists of the local Board of Labor. So the Government dismissed the Board, ordering a new election. When a meeting of ten thousand workmen elected to the new Board eight members of the old, in defiance of the Government decree, the Government found itself in a most awkward situation—compelled either to pursue a losing warfare or to accept an ignominious rebuff. Meanwhile the strike had subsided, almost by magic, and the Government decided to let well alone. The day of reckoning in Parliament was not long delayed. The dissolution of the Genoese Board of Labor, loudly decried as an act of tyranny, consolidated the Radical Left against the Ministry; the failure to dissolve the second Board, again, was regarded as a sign of cowardice by the Conservative Right. Both friends and enemies of the Government joined in the vote of "no confidence" that led to the resignation of the Ministry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"LEST WE FORGET."

The infamy of a broken promise is in direct proportion to the solemnity and particularity of its original affirmation, and to the frequency and fervor with which it has been reaffirmed. It is, therefore, a most wholesome and needed thing, at this time when our rulers are preparing to violate the pledge they gave to Cuba and the world, to remind ourselves just what and how binding the vow was which the Administration would now make us repudiate.

The language of the Teller resolution, adopted by Congress on April 18, 1898, was most carefully chosen. In addition to the somewhat vague clause declaring that "the people of the Island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent," it went on specifically to recite:

> "The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

If anybody is needed to explain the scope of words so precise, Senator Teller must be admitted to be the highest authority. He drew the resolution, he pressed it to enactment, he knows better than any other what were its intent and effect. His explanation, given at the very time, was as follows:

> "Mr. President, I want the Senate . . . to say to the world, in the *most emphatic manner possible*, that we do not intend in any way or manner to derive benefit from this intervention. Spain is too weak and too poor to pay indemnity. I want the Senate to say that *we do not intend to take that island;* that, whatever we may do as to some other islands, as to this island, the great bone of contention, we do not intend to take it. . . . I propose . . . to *make it clear to the world* that it shall not be said by any European Government, when we go out to make battle for the liberty and freedom of Cuban patriots, that we are doing it for the purpose of aggrandizement for ourselves or the *increasing of our territorial holdings.*"

This is contemporary interpretation of the highest and most unescapable significance. If anything were needed to clinch it, we might cite a little colloquy which took place between Senator Cockrell and Senator Allison on the day after the joint resolution was passed. The former had questioned the real purpose of the President to establish a free and independent Cuba; but Mr. Allison closed his mouth by citing the sweeping language of the Teller resolution. And Senator Spooner argued with his customary force that, when we said "independent" Cuba, we meant a Cuba independent not only of Spain and all European Powers, but of the United States as well. Nor in the whole debate in those excited days was there a single objection made in Congress to the Teller resolution. No man dared to mutter against it. Both Houses talked of nothing but our "high and holy" purpose to free Cuba and make her independent. Senators Frye and Gallinger and the others who now say that they never approved of the Teller resolution, took precious good care at the time to keep their doubts to themselves. The votes against the joint resolution—as in the House by Messrs. Boutelle, Johnson, and McCall—were given in opposition to the whole war policy, not at all in dislike of the Teller resolution. So far as the record and contemporaneous evidence show, that declaration of national purpose was made by the united voice of the American Congress and people. No country could bind itself by a more solemn covenant.

Surely, it is not necessary to argue this to Republicans. Their own highest party tribunal, the National Convention, set forth the exact truth in its platform of last year, when it said that the promise made to Cuba was uttered *"in the same voice by which war was declared."* The platform added: "To the letter this pledge will be performed." The case could not be better put. If there was any sanction to our declaration of war, it extended to our undertaking to keep our hands off Cuba after Spain was driven out. The declaration of war against Mexico, falsely reciting that the Mexicans were the aggressors, has been stigmatized as war with "superadded falsehood." It is evident that the phrase which the Republican party is inviting the future historian to use of the war against Spain, is, war with superadded perjury.

President McKinley is now represented as saying that he "always disapproved" the Teller resolution. Possibly; but he has, at any rate, committed himself in the most explicit way to its binding character. In his letter of acceptance, last year, he referred to our "sacred guarantees to the people of Cuba." There might be some possibility of an agile man dodging on that language, but the most elastic and shifty could not get away from the terms held by the President in his annual message to Congress in 1899. He therein referred to the joint resolution promising Cuba, on the part of the United States, "to leave the government and control of the island to its people," and added:

> *"The pledge contained in this resolution is of the highest honorable obligation, and must be sacredly kept."*

Are we to show ourselves a nation of false-swearers? Is our national good faith to be made a sneer and a hissing in all the world? If not, it is time that the President, that Secretary Root, that a Republican Congress, left off talking about the need of exacting guarantees from Cuba before we grant her even a crippled independence. All that must come later. Our relations to Cuba must all be determined by negotiation with an unfettered Government of Cuba. It would be better for the President to go to war with Cuba and conquer her fairly and squarely, than to try to cheat and overreach her, while blackening the American name in the act. War is an awful evil; but perjury by a mighty people is worse. We might better be beaten in a great battle, lose all our ships, have our commerce swept from the seas, see famine stalk through the land, than be made to appear, as we should be if the Administration's avowed purpose is executed, a nation as false as a rope of sand, whose plighted faith sits as lightly upon it as dicers' oaths.

OUR PHILIPPINE BALANCE-SHEET.

Last week brought the completion of two years since the ratification of the Treaty of Paris enabled President McKinley to add certain "gems and glories of the tropic seas," as he proudly called them, to the national domain. Americans are a thrifty and prudent people, unless all proverbs lie, and should be ready to strike a balance of our Philippine business up to date. The first account would relate purely to the money investment, and the return thus far had would stand as follows:

WILLIAM McKINLEY IN ACCOUNT WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Dr.		*Cr.*	
To one archipelago.	$20,000,000	By two years' exports to Philippines, say $3,200,000, profit on which at 12 per cent. is..	$384,000
To benevolently assimilating the same, 730 days, at $750,000 a day...	547,000,000		
To expenses able negotiators Paris Treaty.....	222,000		
To two islands which able negotiators thought they had bought.....	100,000		
	$567,322,000		
	384,000		
Profit and loss....	$566,938,000		

Evidently "there are millions in" the islands; but they are so far "in" that it may be doubted if we ever get them out.

Charles Sumner said that President Grant's scheme to annex San Domingo was but a plan to "buy a bloody lawsuit." President McKinley bought of Spain a still bloodier insurrection. The cost of the islands in terms of flesh and blood and misery should furnish the next page of our Philippine account. But here it is hard to be exact. We know, it is true, that 711 American soldiers have been killed outright in the Philippines, that 446 have died of wounds, and 2,184 of disease; but no figures can set forth the story of ruined health, crippled bodies, and maimed lives which always lies behind the official returns of casualties. Then where are we to reckon in the 30,000 Filipinos whose lives have been taken? Are they a set-off to our own losses? But they are subjects of the United States, and the Supreme Court may decide that they are our fellow-citizens. However, we will be generous and allow the Imperialists to put the slaughtered Filipinos on the credit side of the account. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will also give them the slain or starved women and children, the looted homes, the smoking towns, the waste fields. It is hard to see just where the pecuniary or moral profit of all this comes in, but, such as it is, the Imperialists are entitled to it.

A correct Philippine balance-sheet would also show the respective profit and loss in the moral and political sphere. Figures and values cannot, in this part of the statement, be sharply defined; but the two sides of the account would stand something like this:

LOSS.	GAIN.
Confidence and admiration of oppressed peoples.	Applause of arbitrary and oppressive rulers.
Gratitude of struggling republics.	Thanks of republic-destroyers.
Watchwords of liberty.	Shibboleths of Empire.
Peaceful expansion.	Criminal aggression.
Ideals of the fathers.	Toys of the nursery.
Reverence for the Constitution.	Trust in force.
The party of moral ideas.	The party of the pocket-book.

Again we leave it to the Imperialists to say on which side the balance is. From what we know of them, we are sure, however, that, as Thomas Fuller always made the praise and glory of God come out in the conclusion, no matter what his premises, so they can infer glory and greatness and goodness where others are able to see only shame and contempt.

Any prudent business concern "writes off for depreciation," or wear and tear of plant, from time to time. We are bound to do the same in looking into the actual status of our Philippine investment. One of our most valuable pieces of machinery, for example, "the consent of the governed," is hopelessly rusted and broken down. We can never use it again, and should strike it from our list of assets. It is obvious, too, that we shall have to get something to put in the place of the old Constitution, which is plainly obsolete. "No taxation without representation" has served us long, but the really up-to-date government plants have now introduced "Tax according to your own sweet will" in its place, and we shall have to adopt that style. Our stock of national consistency and good faith is clearly so much depreciated that it would not be honest bookkeeping to carry it any longer at par. On the other hand, our stock of false pretences, hypocritical professions, and silly boasting has been enormously increased by our two years in the Philippines, and if we can only get the world to take it at its nominal value, we may yet be able to lift our eyes from the ground and look the nations in the face again.

TENDENCIES IN STATE LEGISLATION.

The New York State Library has for some years made it a practice to collate and classify the statutes passed by the Legislatures of all the States. The compilation for the year 1900 has lately been published, and it is possible to derive from its contents some idea of the causes operating generally upon the law-making powers. There is certainly no lack of material. The number of new laws here summarized is 1,469, and the number of Constitutional amendments voted on is 38; while there have been 52 decisions of the courts declaring statutes unconstitutional. The State Librarian declares in his preface that States which do not study their neighbors' methods of government are as sure to lag behind as is the manufacturer who does not study his competitor's methods of production. The analogy would be more perfect were the products of legislation furnished according to the law of supply and demand; but it does not follow because a law is passed that the community desires it. We must admit, however, that legislation is, to a certain extent, a marketable commodity, and that those who want a law can often get it by paying for it. Nor is competition between States altogether unknown, for the State of Delaware has recently overbid New Jersey in the liberality of its incorporation laws, and the State of New York is considering what offers it can make in this direction.

But upon examination of the statutes here gathered we find, on the whole, surprisingly little deliberate imitation. It would be hardly too much to say that every Legislature goes its own way, without displaying any consciousness of the existence of similar bodies. Many of our legislators are lawyers; but very few lawyers know much about the legislation of any State except that wherein they practise, and those who have such knowledge keep out of politics, and are therefore kept out of the Legislature. Some years ago a number of lawyers in different States combined for the purpose of securing something like uniformity in certain branches of legislation affecting the general business interests of the country, and they succeeded in procuring some legislative recognition. The field was certainly a promising one; but we search the volume before us in vain for any evidence that the movement is still in existence. We fear that the evidence rather indicates that a bad law is more likely to be copied than a good one. Thus, Iowa has followed the example of Ohio in rewarding informers for getting personal property on the tax lists, and Ohio has followed that of New York in forbidding the employment of workmen by Governmental bodies, or contractors therewith, for more than eight hours a day; although the "prevailing rate-of-wages" feature has not yet been adopted.

Such similarity in legislation as exists appears to be due to public opinion manifesting itself broadly throughout the country, or to the efforts of reformers working to introduce their measures in every State. The outcry against "Trusts" has recently subsided, and we find that only in Mississippi was legislation against them attempted. The same is true of "department stores"; the only statute against them, that of Missouri, has been declared unconstitutional A like fate befell the Rhode Island statute against "Trading stamps"; but statutes against them in several other States are still on the books. In Missouri the attempt has been made, although it has failed wherever it has been tried, to tax mortgages by treating them as interests in real property; the owner of the property being assessed only on his equity of redemption, but allowed to pay the tax of the mortgagee, who cannot make any contract throwing it back on the borrower. This statute, it is safe to say, will be repealed very soon. In general there appears to be less hostility displayed toward corporations, although their liabilities are increased in a number of ways. Probably the most onerous requirement made of railroads is that of Massachusetts, which prescribes "workmen's trains" with nominal rates of fare in the region about Boston. The competition of the electric lines has been so severe as to diminish the local passenger business of the railways; and to compel them to sell commutation tickets for distances not exceeding fifteen miles at a rate not exceeding $3 a mile a year, is a severe blow. Massachusetts has also commanded the street railways to transport scholars to and from school at half rates. Like Massachusetts, Iowa and New Jersey have authorized the transportation of children to and from the higher public schools at the public expense.

A number of States show a disposition to regulate party caucuses, to perfect the Australian ballot system, and to introduce voting by machinery. Equally marked is the growth of the movement to promote the establishment of public libraries by State subvention, Iowa leading the way, and one or two of the Southern States being aroused to action. Not a few of the States have passed laws for the improvement of highways, the influence of the bicyclist proving still potent in some cases, and the importance of wide wagon tires being recognized. Massachusetts, however, is still alone in the systematic construction of State roads, a policy of very doubtful expediency. But aid is granted by several States to local bodies that undertake such improvements. Here, as well as in many other directions, we observe the steady enlargement of the "police power," manifested in the establishment of commissions, the raising of salaries, the regulation of employments, and the extension of supervision. There has not been much "labor" legislation, and, as usual, some of it has been declared un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constitutional. There has been a marked increase in the pension legislation in favor of the Confederate veterans, and the heroes of the Spanish war have been generally favored. Nothing quite so bad has been done by any State as by Ohio, which has created an "Ohio soldiers' claims" office, for the purpose of preparing and collecting demands on the United States Treasury.

Few important changes have been made in substantive law, although the perfecting of administrative machinery always goes on. Slow but encouraging progress is observable in the laws regulating the treatment of the insane and of dependent and neglected children. There is occasional recognition of the importance of reformatory agencies and of separating young offenders from old. Little has been done to provide convicts with suitable employment, although their treatment is ameliorated in some of the Southern States. The system of release on parole has been adopted in Kentucky, persons convicted of murder being especially favored. The plan of committing first offenders to the charge of probation officers is growing in favor; but no State has ventured to adopt the "indeterminate sentence." On the whole, when we consider the activity of our legislators, the net results to civilization of their proceedings is disappointingly small. Nevertheless the losses can frequently be repaired hereafter, and many of the gains are permanent.

COPYRIGHT LAW AMENDMENT.

In his report on the results of the International Copyright Law, the Commissioner of Labor has brought together a variety of interesting and valuable suggestions in answer to his interrogation: In what respects do you think the law in question should be amended or changed?

That the abolition of the law is the best way to amend it, is the view of a couple of publishers, while a dozen or so profess themselves entirely satisfied with it, or sufficiently content to advise letting well alone. On the other hand, a large number of publishers give serious thought to the possible amendment of the present law; and the alterations proposed, as well as the names of those who suggest them, augur well for a growing appreciation of the equities involved in the protection of literary property and for the vitality of the International Copyright Law itself.

The opinions expressed regarding the stipulation of compulsory American manufacture in the case of books, first of all attract attention. A certain number of printers and publishers, directly or indirectly, indicate their approval of the provision of the act of March 3, 1891, requiring that copyright books shall be printed from type set within the limits of the United States; but only one of the older, well-known publishing firms—Lea Brothers & Co. of Philadelphia—is included. They contend that "the foresight and wisdom of the Typographical Unions of the country, backed by all other branches of organized labor, in insisting upon the manufacturing clause, have been clearly vindicated," and that but for this clause, workmen would have suffered to an untold extent. To offset this, a number of publishers—including such well-known firms as the American Book Co., Burrows Brothers Co., the De Vinne Co., D. C. Heath & Co., Henry Holt & Co., Little, Brown & Co., McClurg & Co., L. C. Page & Co., G. P. Putnam's Sons, and the F. A. Stokes Co.—assert that the stipulation has been of little or no use either to printers or to publishers, and that it should be done away with on the grounds (1) that it is no longer needed for the protection of printers, owing to composition being cheaper here than abroad, (2) that electrotyping is not only cheaper here but better, (3) that there is no sufficient advantage in the importation of English editions with the present duty, (4) that the tariff laws afford ample protection against the importation of sheets, (5) that the special tastes of American book-buyers can be trusted to compel manufacture here to meet requirements, (6) that it involves a wrong principle to compel the producer to do his manufacturing with one set of printers rather than another, (7) that instead of forcing books to be manufactured in this country, it really forces foreign books to get along without copyright protection, (8) that it is unjust to the book-buyer, (9) that it is a tax on the public, and (10) that it is an unfair exchange to receive unrestricted protection for our authors abroad and impose this onerous burden on foreign authors here. The weight both of numbers and of names is clearly on the side of doing away entirely with this restriction.

The requirement of American typesetting bears with peculiar hardship on the author whose work is in some language other than English—for example, Portuguese, Dutch, or Russian. He can hardly expect to sell an edition of his book in the United States large enough to justify resetting in the original, although a translation into English might not only be welcome but popular. But, under the law in force, the exclusive right of translation depends upon the production, not later than the day of publication abroad, of an edition of the original work produced from type set within the limits of the United States. This not only is manifestly unjust to the foreign author, but frequently proves a loss to the American publisher, who is debarred, by reason of this burdensome stipulation, from securing adequate protection for a sure-selling translation. The publishers, therefore, propose that, in the case of foreign books other than English, the law should be amended so that the authorized English translation of a foreign book, printed from type set within the limits of the United States, should be subject to copyright protection, to the exclusion of any unauthorized translation. Several of the publishers who urge this change (including D. Appleton & Co., Little, Brown & Co., and Charles Scribner's Sons) offer no condition as to change in the time of making deposit of copies, but Mr. George Haven Putnam argues, with justice, that a specified period of time, say twelve months from registration of title, should be allowed within which to produce the translation printed from type set within the limits of the United States, with the proviso that if, within that date, no authorized English version appeared, the right to produce the work in English should fall into the public domain. He also calls attention to the fact that such a provision would be in line with the arrangements in force under the Berne Convention. But it is to be observed that, by the provision of the amendments to that treaty adopted at Paris May 4, 1896, the author of any country of the International Copyright Union enjoys in the other countries of the Union the exclusive right of making or authorizing the translation of his work for the whole term of the copyright, and loses it only in case he shall not have made use of this right within a period of ten years from first publication of the original; in other words, he has a period of ten years, instead of one, in which to arrange for a translation.

The desirability of extending international relations as to copyright is expressed by several publishers, not only that we may deal equitably with foreign authors, but that we may secure for our own authors' work advantageous treatment everywhere abroad, through negotiation—as one publisher expresses it—"from the broad view point of international justice and equity." The advantage of the adhesion of the United States to the Berne Convention has manifestly been brought home to many of our publishers, and it is to be remembered that it is primarily the typesetting clause that prevents the entry of the United States into the International Copyright Union, thus debarring all American producers of literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic productions from the immense advantage of securing full protection for their productions in all countries of that Union, by merely complying with the requirements of our own copyright laws necessary to secure protection within the United States.

That provision of our copyright law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which requires as a prerequisite to copyright protection the deposit of copyright copies "not later than the day of publication thereof in this or any foreign country," is deprecated with general unanimity (only one publisher is for it), on the ground that the requirement is without apparent compensation to any one, and that it imposes a very heavy and unjust burden upon foreign authors, especially new authors, whose success with the public is still uncertain, and causes not only difficulties for American publishers, but often direct loss of valuable copyright privileges when unforeseen contingencies arise which prevent simultaneous publication. This stipulation has proved of unexpected difficulty and uncertainty in the case of serial publication, and the remedy proposed is a time allowance within which the deposits are to be made; the suggestions as to the period being sixty days, ninety days, six and twelve months, respectively, after date of publication abroad, or from two to three months or one year after preliminary registration of title in the United States Copyright Office.

The question of an equitable term of copyright is touched upon by several publishers, some of whom content themselves with indicating a desire for an extension of the present terms of protection, while two suggest the life of the author and thirty years; two the life of the author and fifty years; and three register their belief that the right should be enjoyed in perpetuity.

Several miscellaneous changes are suggested, ranging from the proposal to allow the temporary deposit of typewritten copies, to the taxing of the copyrights of foreign authors. Space prevents consideration of these various projects, but mention, at least, should be made of what is perhaps the most practical suggestion of all, concurred in by several publishers, namely, that all questions as to the amendment of the existing copyright laws shall be referred to a commission of experts, comprising representatives of all the several interests to be considered—producers of works of literature and art, publishers of books and works of art, at least one skilled copyright lawyer, and some one to act for the general public. To these should be added representatives of the interests of music-composers and playwrights. As Mr. G. H. Putnam truly says, "all existing copyright systems of the world excepting that of the United States have been the work of such commissions of experts"; and good sense dictates that the dangerous tinkering to which our copyright laws have been subjected for thirty years, should give place to this more rational method of treatment.

FITZEDWARD HALL.

The romance of a marvellously full and busy life, begun at Troy, N. Y., on March 21, 1825, and terminated on February 1, 1901, at Marlesford, in English Suffolk, had its origin in Dana's 'Two Years before the Mast.' One of five brothers, sons of Daniel Hall, a Vermonter by birth, had his head turned by that classic, and ran away to sea. Fitzedward, being the oldest of them, was sent after him, and for that purpose sailed from Boston in a merchantman for Calcutta in the spring of 1846. By the wrecking of the vessel off the mouth of the Ganges in September his destiny was fixed, for, not being able to return directly, as he had planned, he improved his enforced stay ashore by taking a few lessons in Hindustanî and Persian, and this ended by his resolving to study these languages (to which he added Bengalî and Sanskrit) thoroughly. Accordingly he spent three years in Calcutta, and there laid the foundations of his Oriental scholarship and life-work.

His schooling had been at Walpole, N. H., and at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and he took the civil engineer's degree at the Troy Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1842. Thence his father, a lawyer by profession, and himself a graduate of two colleges, Middlebury and Dartmouth, sent him to Harvard to join the class of the future Professors Child, Lane, and Norton. He was cut off from his Commencement by the sudden mission to India, and left bearing voluntary letters from President Everett to the Bishop of Calcutta and others. Up to this time his attention had been pretty equally divided between languages, mathematics, and natural sciences, including medicine. To his classmates at Harvard he seemed systematically to slight his studies, but he was an assiduous student of Romaic in an extra class under Professor Sophocles, and he prided himself on discovering the source of any English set for Greek exercise in the space of half an hour. In fact, from the age of fifteen he had been taking notes on English words and phrases, and this became the passion of his maturer years. Nor did he fail to profit by the English drill of "Potty" (Prof. Edward Tyrrel) Channing.

From Calcutta our American proceeded to Ghazeepoor on the Upper Ganges, tarrying five months, and to Benares, which he reached on January 16, 1850. Here, a month later, he received an unsolicited appointment, in the Government College, to a post which, in 1853, was converted into an Anglo-Sanskrit professorship. In July, 1855, he was transferred to Rajpootana, as Inspector of Public Instruction for Ajmere and Mairwara; in December, 1856, he was promoted to a like inspectorship for the Central Provinces, with his headquarters at Saugor. At the pestilential fort of this place he was shut up for nine months during the Sepoy mutiny, shared in the defence with a skill as a rifleman acquired in tiger-shooting, and volunteered for further service after the relief, as his educational charge was hopelessly demoralized. He now took a year and a half's vacation in England, France, and in his native country, which he reached in the autumn of 1859, returning to England for the Oxford degree of D.C.L. in 1860. In the spring of 1862 he bade good-bye to India, where he had amply earned his doctor's title by prolific writing in the Journal of the (Bengal) Asiatic Society, in Indian magazines, and in not less than a dozen printed volumes, to be continued after his establishment in England. Of these we gave some account in our notice of his seventieth birthday, in 1895, the year which witnessed the conferring upon him of Harvard's degree of LL.D. He was the first American to publish a Sanskrit text. His prodigious powers as a reader in Sanskrit were comparable to those displayed in English, and made him a most accomplished annotator of texts, while aiding him to resolve with singular penetration and success some of the complex problems of Hindu literary chronology.

His first home in England was in London, where he held the professorship of Sanskrit, Hindustanî, and Indian Jurisprudence in King's College, and the librarianship of the India Office. In 1864 he was appointed to the examinership in Hindustanî and Hindî in connection with the Civil-Service Commissioner; in 1880 in Sanskrit, succeeding Professors Max Müller and Cowell; about 1887 in English also. This employment he retained up to the time of his death. Meanwhile, in 1869, he removed to Marlesford, some eighty miles distant from the metropolis, and in this retreat he completed his edition of the 'Vishnupurâna' in six substantial volumes, costing eight years of steady labor. Half the matter in it was of his own contributing, much of it being Sanskrit, from works not yet edited, and the manuscripts quoted being his own. Now began those works on his mother-tongue which revealed his unrivalled store of accumulations, and made him known to his countrymen at large, while bringing him into sharp contact with sciolists and pretenders. Such were his 'Recent Exemplifications of False Philology' (1872), 'Modern English' (1873), 'On English Adjectives in -able, with Special Reference to Reliable' (1877); 'Doctor Indoctus' (1880), etc., etc.; and the numerous showings of his hand, so to speak, on various words and locutions, with which, under the modest signature of "F. H.," he for years enriched the columns of this journal, the *American Journal of Philology*, and other mediums.

Such scholarly activity, of which the outcome in 1888 was thirty-six volumes in the British Museum catalogue, written, translated, or edited by Dr. Hall, cannot fairly be appreciated without recalling his incessant note-taking, and the fact that he kept duplicates of nothing that he wrote, and that he had not even the aid of a copyist in his literary labors. But wonder grows when we consider the purely gratuitous burden assumed by him in his later years in the service of the Oxford English Dictionary and the parallel enterprise of the Dialect Dictionary. The instance was freshly afforded of a prophet not without honor save in his own country. In 1847 he had sent materials to Dr. Worcester for his Dictionary, and a large collection of words in 1861, many of which were embodied in the supplement; but no public acknowledgment was made of this aid. Some twenty years ago he offered to furnish Worcester's editor with ten thousand new words, but the offer was declined with scant courtesy, and Webster's editor was equally indifferent to it, though Dr. Hall's 'Recent Exemplifications' and 'Modern English' had been for a decade under their eyes—or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might have been! His disinterestedness was obliged to await the inception of the Philological Society's great enterprise, when he undertook to read and criticise without remuneration every proof-sheet of the 'New English Dictionary,' and supply fresh and indispensable quotations from his millionaire treasury, at the rate of two to three hundred a month, and at an outlay in time of six or eight hours daily. Dr. Murray, who never set eyes on his retiring colleague, has borne constant testimony to the pricelessness of his coöperation:

"His help to the Dictionary has been, and is, simply beyond expression; and it will be a sorrowful day for us when he leaves us. He has, indeed, made arrangements whereby his materials and many of his books shall come into my possession"—we quote from a private letter of 1894—"but that is a very slight affair; it is his own enormous memory, his richly stored brain, his knowledge how to utilize his own notes, and where to look for a word or phrase, that will be lost for ever. . . . He has looked upon the perfecting of the Dictionary as one of his great duties, and right nobly and magnificently he has worked at it. It has sometimes been thought that my references to his help partook of the language of exaggeration; I have always felt how inadequate they were to express what the Dictionary owes to him."

Professor Wright's 'Dialect Dictionary' appealed to Dr. Hall with peculiar force from his local attachment to Suffolk, whose dialect so frequently reminded him of the speech of New England, and with whose common people he mixed freely as a fellow-man and as a generous benefactor. Every one of the more than 2,200 Suffolkisms he contributed down to the end of M, he had heard himself. This labor went on *pari passu* with that for the Oxford Dictionary.

Dr. Hall certainly had thus a fair claim to pass for an Englishman apart from his appearance, which imposed upon strangers, his domicile, and his Government employment in a post for which the competition was very great, but from which he could never be dislodged. His last communication to this journal, however, was signed "Civis Americanus," a title of which he was very proud, though fate willed that he should never cast a vote even for President—neither for Cleveland, nor against Bryan. On the one hand, he paid the penalty of his great learning in rebuffs on the part of Englishmen who looked askance at a Yankee presuming to have something to teach them; on the other, of neglect on the part of Americans whom distance prevented from rating him at his true value. His polemical writing naturally made him enemies on both sides of the water, at the expense of his just reputation. But above all he came to reside in England in the midst of the civil war, when any American was liable in society to have his feelings wounded by heedless or malevolent remarks on his country, and he has himself related in our columns instances of such experiences in his own case. He quickly resolved to be no Englishman's guest for a single night. Though he had an exceptional acquaintance, for the last twenty years of his life, with rural England, following his rod, and indulged in the freest hospitality, he yet sat down to no one's table but his own. Needless to say that, from the moment he cast in his lot among Englishmen, he was always, as he wrote to the *Nation* in 1896, "prompt, and not seldom at the cost of rude handling, to defend my countrymen, their institutions, and their conduct, so far forth as I have thought them defensible." But it can hardly be doubted that he was supersensitive, and liable to take affront where none was intended.

All that he received from this journal in the way of honorarium he dispensed in charity. His largess in his own neighborhood could be reckoned in hundreds of pounds annually. He had married at Delhi in 1854 an Englishwoman, daughter of Lieut.-Col. Arthur Shuldham, of an ancient family with large connections; his sons were educated at English schools. He was the largest subscriber to the cost of the Dialect Dictionary. And still there stirred in him rather that transubstantiated English blood which flowed from his first ancestor, John Hall, who came to America from Coventry in 1630. His grandfather was from Cape Cod, served as a naval officer in the Revolutionary war, became a prisoner in England, was for seven years a judge of the Supreme Court of Vermont, and died in 1809. His father was a rich man, able to send four of his sons to Harvard. His mother, Anjinette Fitch, was the child of first cousins, grandchildren of Thomas Fitch, the penultimate Colonial Governor of Connecticut, and a descendant of one of three brothers, Essex men, all of them Puritan clergymen, and graduates of Cambridge University, England, who emigrated in 1637. On the college at Cambridge, Mass., his alma mater, Dr. Hall bestowed during his lifetime a thousand Oriental manuscripts, which cost him $10,000, and many of which are unique; besides quite as many correspondingly valuable books.

Dr. Hall possessed an extraordinary physique. Up to his seventieth year at least he walked two miles daily, in rain or shine, needing but half an hour for its accomplishment. Yet for half his life he was afflicted with chronic bronchitis. His digestion, however, remained perfect, and he favored it with a very simple diet. He weathered in 1894 a desperate attack of pleuro-pneumonia, which he expected would send him to the Woking crematorium; as of rheumatic fever in 1889, when he wrote, "So far, however, am I a genuine American that nothing dispirits me." "Zero or thereabouts," he wrote in 1891, "is still my supreme delight; as I have warm blood, and plenty of it." In his spacious house at Marlesford, with attractive grounds and a beautiful conservatory, one saw, in these latter years, a tall, big man with white beard, a bald head, thickly fringed about the lower part; somewhat stooping, but quick in his step and movements; hawk-eyed, and with a look of command; frank-spoken to the last degree; with a mania for flowers as for angling; conspicuously kindly of heart, and a power for good in his immediate vicinity. Of a Sunday afternoon neighbors were wont to assemble in his parlors for vocal music.

It remains, in taking leave of a character so interesting and lovable, whom we have been privileged to know somewhat intimately for a quarter of a century, and to whose friendship for this journal we must record our deep obligation, to say something of him as a writer. "Though I have lived away from America upwards of forty-six years," he wrote to the London *Academy*, in 1893, "I feel, to this hour, in writing English, that I am writing a foreign language, and that, if not incessantly on my guard, I am in peril of stumbling." Reviewing carefully that same year his printed writings in Indian magazines, "enough to make a good-sized volume," in 1850-'52, "I have," as he wrote us privately, "detected only one Americanism in the whole—'*at* the South' for '*in* the South.' Yet I never consulted any Englishman about my phraseology. Some day I may put on paper how it was that I succeeded in learning to write our language catholicly—*i. e.*, so as not to reveal my nationality." These confessions explain in part the apparent constraint of his diction, which was much enhanced by the very wealth of his vocabulary and by a too close and inflexible punctuation. Hence, his prose was apt to be difficult reading. Had he combined with his vast learning a light and playful style, he would not more effectually have strewn the field with the slain, but he would have made the process as delightful as it was edifying. As it is, his works are a permanent resource against the ignoramus and the charlatan who seek to make the English language into their own likeness.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON THE LIFE OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

LONDON, January 29, 1901.

Although the newspapers will have conveyed to every one in the United States the immense impression made in England, and, indeed, all over Europe, by the death of the Queen, they may not, perhaps, have fully explained exactly what it was in her character and career that won for her so much respect and affection from all classes, and made the grief at her loss so absolutely genuine. An outburst of regret naturally produces an outburst of praise; but the praise is so general and high-flown that the true and peculiar elements of excellence which deserved it are in danger, I will not say of being forgotten, but of being imperfectly realized. Two of these elements are worth dwelling on, for they give to the Queen's reign a unique significance which historians will note in days to come.

One is the part she has played in the development of the British Constitution. When she mounted the throne in 1837, only five years had elapsed since the great Reform Act. It was nothing less than a bloodless revolution, carried through by the regular forms of law. It shifted power from the landed aristocracy to the middle classes, relegated the House of Lords to a position of acknowledged inferiority, and materially changed the position of the Crown—not, of course, by changing its legal position, but by making the whole nation so unmistakably sovereign as to render it impossible for any future king to resume the policy of George the Third. Nevertheless, it was still quite uncertain what the position of the Crown would be, and how its dignity and its titular authority would be reconciled and made to harmonize with the actual control which the people, through the House of Commons, had now begun to exercise under William the Fourth, an honest sailor, little versed in history or politics. The requisite adjustment had not been made. It was left for Queen Victoria to make it. In her reign of nearly sixty-four years, she had ample opportunity, and she used that opportunity with extraordinary judgment, tact, and self-restraint. The British Constitution, as everybody knows, consists very largely in usages which are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not, and hardly could be, embodied in law, but which are observed because they have been observed, and because they are felt to be wholesome for the conduct of Government. When the Queen began her reign, these usages had not yet settled down into that altered form which the new conditions introduced by the Reform Act rendered necessary. It is she and her Ministers who have formed them; and, as she was a permanent quantity, while they came and went, her share has been the greatest in this work, so essential to the proper play of the organs of government.

Thus, it has become recognized that the Crown has the right to be informed of all the decisions taken by her Ministers before they are made public, and to see important dispatches before they are sent to be communicated to foreign Powers. The Crown is entitled to express its opinion to the Ministry upon these decisions or communications, and to remonstrate if it conceives that they are inexpedient. On the other hand, if the Ministry adhere to their view, it is the duty of the Crown to accept that view and to follow all such advice as they may tender; the responsibility, of course, lying with them alone. So the Crown must abstain from trying to influence Parliament, as George the Third tried to do and unfortunately succeeded in doing, and must even conceal its own private sentiments regarding current matters of political controversy. Nothing could have been more wise and more conducive to the public interest than the Queen's action in this matter. She often entertained decided views regarding questions at issue between the two political parties, but she never allowed these views to become known. They could not, of course, be kept altogether secret from the few who were behind the scenes in politics, but she herself did not disclose them; and it is to the credit of English statesmen of both parties that they never attempted in any way to use what they might happen to know for the purpose of influencing Parliament or the public. To have done so would no doubt have been a breach of duty, and the error might have recoiled upon whoever had so erred. Still, it is remarkable that this tacit rule of the Constitution should have been so carefully observed. And it ought further to be noted that the Queen never suffered her personal views of a political controversy to affect her private relations with her Ministers. She might have individual preferences for one or another—no human being can help having such preferences; but those preferences were not determined by the political opinions of the Ministers. She showed just as cordial a kindness to those who were engaged in advocating a policy which had not her own personal sympathy, as to those who were resisting that policy. It may be said that the interests of the monarchy prescribed such a course. That is true, but that does not lessen the credit due to a sovereign who not only discerned clearly what the Constitution required, but consistently refused to allow her political feelings to disturb her personal relations with those who served her.

Within the limits which have just been indicated, there was room for action by the Crown in the interests of the nation not as by way of interfering with the conduct of affairs by the responsible Ministry, but in cases where a suggestion could be made from a quarter standing above party, which might point a way out of embarrassments. Several times this is understood to have been done by the Queen, and always with happy results. She had the advantage of good confidential media of communication in her successive private secretaries, who were, of course, careful to keep themselves from political proclivities, and she chose them with great judgment. More than once, also, she is believed to have been able, with the approval of her Ministers, to make unofficial representations in foreign affairs; and that to the great benefit of European peace. These cases were, however, altogether exceptional, and are to be mentioned chiefly because they show the purposes which a monarchy may occasionally serve under a tactful monarch. Apart altogether from them, the conspicuous service which the Queen rendered was to establish a definite constitutional practice regarding the position of the Crown in the regular working of the Constitution. It is an inestimable service, and a service useful not only to England for the days to come, but also to the British self-governing colonies, in which the Governor holds towards the Ministerial Executive and towards the Legislature a position similar to that of the Crown at home; and even to those foreign countries which, like Holland, Belgium, and Italy, have reproduced, with more or less variation in details, the English Cabinet system.

The other point in which the life and reign of the Queen have a remarkable significance for history consists in what may be called the new reading she has given of the functions of a sovereign, the new aspect in which she has presented monarchy to the eyes of the world. She has made it more popular than it ever was before, not by leading the nation, not by public appeals, not by the exercise of brilliant talents (for when she took wise and useful action, the people knew nothing about it), not by pomp or display such as sometimes catches a nation's fancy, but by the example which she showed of the simple virtues of a wife, a mother, and a friend. She made her own private and personal life looked to by the nation as the pattern of what an English home should be. The popularity which was for a time enjoyed by George III. was largely due to the fact that he did to some extent do this. But the Queen did it with more geniality, with more sympathy, and over a longer course of years, while at the same time keeping herself, as George III. did not do, out of all the controversies of parties and sects. There have been able men and good men among the monarchs of England for the last eleven centuries, in as large proportion as in most kingdoms, but there have been very few amiable men, very few whose characters, taken apart from their abilities or their achievements, have recommended them to the affection of their people. One has almost to go back to the half-legendary King Alfred to find a sovereign who excited both personal respect and personal affection in the sense in which the Queen has excited it in England during the last thirty years. Nor were the four preceding Queens of England any happier in this respect than the kings, although a female sovereign may seem better fitted for the display of the qualities that win attachment. The two daughters of Henry VIII. had, in different ways, too much of their father in them; the two daughters of James II., though they did not inherit his particular faults, hardly reached the hearts of the people. It was reserved for Queen Victoria to show that the occupant of a throne may secure the affection of a nation by holding on a throne just that line of conduct which makes a man or a woman trusted and respected in private life, and by adding to straightforward good sense and good temper that power of feeling sympathy, and of expressing it in a natural, kindly, unpretending way, which touches the heart. The thing seems so simple that one wonders it has been so seldom done; but the fact that monarchs have so seldom done it shows how precious a gift it is. In this aspect, also, the Queen's reign deserves to be memorable. She leaves the monarchy not only, as was well said by Mr. Arthur Balfour, more valuable than ever before in respect of the functions it discharges towards the outlying dominions of England, but also stronger in the sentiments of the people than in the days when its constitutional authority was far more wide. And when one perceives the impression which has been made all over the world—and not least in the United States—by the departure of this venerable figure, which had come to seem almost part of the normal order of the world, the unexampled sorrow of England is no more than was due to one who had made herself the friend and mother of her people.

THE IRISH VIEW.

DUBLIN, January 26, 1901.

It was to be expected that Queen Victoria's death should call forth expressions of sincere regret in all quarters of the civilized world, except where her soldiers are engaged in conflict with a civilized people. It is scarcely realized how little, and why, it is so felt in one of the earliest conquests of her race, the one nearest to her centre of authority, by one of the only three peoples in her wide dominions whose arms are quartered on her standard, and whose cross is borne upon every flag officially flown in her honor.

The absence of genuine affection for her Majesty in the hearts of the vast majority of the Irish people and of sorrow for her death are not due to hardness of heart, want of chivalric feeling, or inherent separatist proclivities. It is all explicable. Her reign has not been to them a happy one. It is true that its conclusion leaves them—such as are in the country—in a happier condition than its opening found them. But this alteration of condition has been attained through ordeals to which the English or any other self-governing people would not have been subjected. It found them 8,000,000 in number; it leaves them 4,500,000. It found them three-tenths of the strength of the United Kingdom; it leaves them one-tenth. Victoria's signature has been attached to some thirty or forty acts of Parliament annulling for them alone ordinary Constitutional safeguards to liberty. She leaves them under such a one, perpetual in its provisions, by which her Viceroy can at any moment, by a stroke of his pen, suspend the liberty of the press, abolish trial by jury, and practically hold in abeyance habeas-corpus. Her initials have been placed most prominently before the eyes of tens of thousands of her Irish subjects upon writs evicting them from lands which they themselves had reclaimed. The associations through which the greater reforms whereon Ireland's present prosperity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly rests were suppressed by proclamations ending with "God save the Queen." In her name were imprisoned those by whose exertions such reforms were mainly accomplished.

Supposing necessary the apathy and delay that have distinguished her Parliament and people in the process of Irish reform, supposing unavoidable the treatment meted out to associations and leaders, all the more would a really great and sympathetic sovereign have exerted herself to lighten the pressure of the iron necessity of things upon a suffering and sorely tried people. Many were the occasions that offered when even a shred of personal sympathy might have allayed fevered passion and diverted the current of Irish thought into happier channels. No people would have been more amenable to such influences than the Irish. Such sympathy as has been from time to time officially communicated has been regulated strictly upon formal and Constitutional lines. If one-half the personal interest in their people occasionally shown within our time by Continental sovereigns during periods of calamity had been by her shown in Ireland's crises, feelings would be very different from what they are. For thirty-nine years she never visited Ireland, and then, last year, under circumstances which deprived her coming of all real grace—it was patently a move on the part of her advisers to encourage Irish enlistment in a war detested by a majority of the Irish people. Behind all this there was more. Her attitude was not alone wanting in sympathy. Within official circles it was known that she was accustomed to say to at least one Irish-born Minister: "You must not say you are Irish!" The reasons for her attitude towards Mr. Gladstone of late years could not be concealed.

Biographers have much to account for in establishing bad blood between peoples as between individuals. A system of united "undenominational" education was set up in Ireland seventy years ago, mainly under the tutelage of Archbishop Whately. Nothing has more contributed to the destruction of its undenominational character than the admission by the Archbishop in a letter (published by his biographer after his death) of his underlying expectation that the system would wean Ireland from Catholicism. So, in memoirs of Prince Albert, the Queen's *alter ego*, the Poles were declared by him to be "no more deserving of sympathy than the Irish," and of O'Connell's death it was he that wrote: "It is a befitting end to an agitator that, two years after he had stood before the world like a colossus, he should pass out of it unnoted, whereas a man of true worth cannot survive his reputation."* This last passage at least was penned during one of the darkest periods of Irish history, when all sympathy was called for, concerning a man deservedly held in the highest respect and deeply mourned by the Irish people.

An occasion such as the present brings into more than ordinary prominence the sad reality of Ireland's being still inhabited by two peoples whose political sympathies are wide apart. By the "loyal minority" the Queen is mourned, as far as outward appearances go, more deeply than upon the average she is mourned in England. There is with them no consciousness of there being an Ireland with separate experiences and feelings from England. They are in such respects more English than the English themselves. The wealth and culture and power are mainly in the hands of the minority; the voting strength in that of the majority. While the flags are half-mast high upon public buildings, and the blinds drawn in all establishments that depend upon the custom of the better classes, the Lord Mayor of Dublin has, by the vote of the corporation, lost his chance of a second term because he joined in an address to the Queen last spring. This divided feeling is deplorable. The minority want the love and respect of the masses. The masses suffer in not having the sympathy of the better-off and more cultured than themselves, and in not taking them as patterns and exemplars in many of the graces of life.

Few of us of the elder generation in Ireland would wish, even if we had the chance, to live through another reign of sixty years, if into it, for our country, were to be crowded such misery and heartburnings, such depopulation, such unnecessary desolations and upturnings as those through which we have lived in the course of the reign of Queen Victoria. D. B.

*The first of these two passages, often quoted, and never (so far as I have heard) repudiated, I have been unable, for the purposes of this writing, to trace. The second stands in Sir T. Martin's five-volume 'Life of the Prince Consort,' published by authority of the Queen.

LAW AND ORDER IN MONTENEGRO.

CAMBRIDGE, December, 1900.

The ancient and venerable tree of justice in front of the Prince of Montenegro's modest palace has fallen, or, to speak by the card, was blown down by a storm last year. Beneath its shade, the sovereign, in good old primitive fashion, has administered justice direct to his people, his word being final in legal as in so many other matters. The right of appeal to his ultimate judgment is freely taken; for, though but an amateur lawyer, his sense of justice is strong, and proves a valuable corrective to the somewhat partial and capricious rulings of the courts. That there should be any courts at all, worthy of the name, in a country not yet emerged from the military into the industrial stage, is noteworthy, however, and reflects the greatest credit on the ruler whose long reign has been such a striking example of a typical B. C. beneficent despotism in full working order at the end of the nineteenth century.

In perfecting the present system, his Highness Nicholas I., "Prince of Montenegro and the Berda," had, of course, some foundation upon which to build, and an interesting foundation it was. The up-to-date reader need hardly be reminded that Montenegro has earned the enthusiastic gratitude of Sir Henry Maine and the rest of the theorists, by preserving in singular purity the early Aryan institution of the House Community. In this the family, and not the individual, is, if the phrase may pass, the legal unit. The collective household owns the land, often mere pathetic scraps, tilled by its individual workers, and all their produce and earnings, even when made in a far country, go to the common fund. At the door of the family are laid the debts, torts, and crimes of each of its members—an ideal system for the rapid growth and artistic development of feuds and vendettas. A group of families traced from some common ancestor forms a brotherhood or clan, which has the communal ownership of forests and pastures. A group of clans make up the tribe (*plemé*), several of which usually compose a district (*nahia*), of which in the seventeenth century there were five, before the recent treaties nearly doubled the area of the country. Disputes within the family were naturally settled by the head of the house, perhaps assisted by the daily general assembly, in which every member of the family had a voice, but the elders really controlled. More extended controversies were taken before the tribal head-man (*kniez*), who to his multifarious duties obligingly added that of general arbitrator. But each was a law unto himself, and at best confined his attention to civil matters, considering such items as blood-feuds, border-raids, etc., quite outside his jurisdiction. Then as now, the final word in everything came from the *Vladika*, or Prince-Bishop-Commander, who, up to the middle of this century, combined in his person the headship of state, church, and army. There was, to be sure, from early times an hereditary "Civil Governor," but the title was decidedly a misnomer, for his duty was the supervision of the defences of the country; and in 1832, when the incumbent was discovered plotting treason, the office suddenly became extinct.

Strangely enough, the first steps towards modern law and order in Montenegro were taken by an impostor, one of the cleverest in history, Stephen the Little, who, pretending to be the murdered Czar Peter III., seized the reins of Government in 1767. He introduced the gentle but progressive art of road-making, took a census, established district courts, in which he thoughtfully prohibited business on Sundays, and came down extremely heavy on evil-doers. Theft he even punished with death; so that, tradition goes, a purse of gold and a silver-mounted pistol left as a test in the middle of the (only) road remained undisturbed for weeks.

The next notable improvement occurred in 1797, when "Saint" Peter, whose tiny chapel crowns the almost inaccessible heights of the Lovčen, superseded the purely traditional justice of the courts by a written code. This, with additions in 1803, comprised thirty-three articles. The influence of the neighboring Orient was strongly felt in them; only one related to real property, viz., that an individual owner of land wishing to sell must first offer it to the members of his family, and then to his neighbors, before looking further for a purchaser. This of course was merely declarative of the immemorial usage of the Croatian community system already spoken of. To this code of Peter I. the headmen swore to conform themselves, but it was a sore let and hindrance to their rule-of-thumb justice, and they soon regarded it so lightly that special judges had to be appointed to interpret and enforce its provisions.

Soon afterward, another inducement to godliness was afforded by the establishment of a regular police throughout the principality. It is rather curious to note here that the luxury of a regular standing army was not indulged in until five years ago, and even the rough "minute-men" organization, with captains of tens and of hundreds, did not come till 1853. The early "bobbies" of Montenegro confined themselves strictly to keeping the local and domestic peace. Little expeditions over the border against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Turks, the hereditary foe, were not only winked at but even looked upon as rather beneficial than otherwise, affording at the same time a safety-valve for the unquenchable martial effervescence of the country, and an opportunity to keep one's hand in for the more serious operations of the desperate conflicts into which the tiny state has been almost unceasingly plunged for the defence of its cherished independence.

Peter II., who succeeded his uncle (for the succession up to 1851 was always from uncle to nephew, as the Prince-Bishop could not marry), tempering justice with mercy, drew up a schedule of fines for every offence, and enforced them by confiscating the law-breaker's most valued property, his weapons. He greatly diminished the causes of blood-feuds by ordering that capital punishment should never be performed by a single executioner, but by a firing-squad of assorted tribesmen. To him also is due the gloomy honor of constructing the first prison. His successor, Danilo II., drew up the Great Charter, of six articles. Herein he separated the religious headship from the other attributes of the sovereign and bestowed it upon a distinct archbishop, to be chosen, however, by the Government. The laws and customs existing were confirmed.

In 1855 he tried his hand at a new code, which continued in force till 1888. Though a considerable advance over that of Peter I., it contained some curious sections. No penalty, for instance, attached to a fatal assault following directly upon the provocation of a blow, while if the insulted party lay low and delayed his retort courteous, a subsequent killing was recognized as murder. Theft, which seems to be held in special abhorrence, was again the object of severe penalties, the more astonishing because the mountaineers are constitutionally honest, and have practically nothing in sight to steal. The judgeships were made elective, and any annoying arrogance of the bench was curbed by the imposition of a fine on a judge who insulted a suitor. Stress was laid on the equality of every citizen before the law, and the equal rights of all to hold office. This, though on its face an attack on the communal system, was perhaps only an amplification of the national motto, "Civil and religious liberty is the reward of valor."

After the treaty of Berlin, Prince Nicholas determined on the construction of a fresh code, and to that end secured the services of the very eminent publicist, Professor Bogosić of the University of Odessa. After a prolonged, minute, and scientific survey of the field, this gentleman determined on a plan unique in the history of modern codes. Recognizing the fact that, in spite of the laws already promulgated, the people still clung tenaciously to their traditional laws and customs, and doubtless influenced by the enormous historical interest of this oldest national statute-book, he deliberately set himself to codify it, with as few alterations as possible, so that the Montenegrins should have "a new code but not new laws." This was finally completed and promulgated in 1888; but, with all its concessions to popular prejudice, and in spite of its learned author's expressions of satisfaction with the manner in which it is interpreted in the lower courts, competent observers hint that it is more or less of a veneer, cited when its weight will clinch a decision, and somehow overlooked when not in accord with the inherited ideas of the judge. In short, the history of codes in Montenegro goes to show that you cannot "throw down" an Early Aryan Institution all at once, even with the aid of a Modern Scientist.

The present judicial organization is an intelligent modernizing of the traditional arrangements. The *nahie* now number ten, mostly composed of several *plemena*, each of which has a "captain" who is the judge of first instance. This gives nearly a hundred inferior courts, well distributed through the whole country. Appeals go up to the district court, situated in the principal town of each *nahia*. The "Great Court" (the Minister of Justice and four members appointed by the Prince), sits at Cettinje in the Old Palace, a squat, surly little semi-fortress in a walled square with big round bastions at the corners.

Close by stands the central prison, of one story, but resplendent in whitewash, with three rows of cells, which open (and apparently remain open) into a central courtyard. It does not seem overcrowded. Crimes of violence are almost unknown. Robbery, as has been stated, is foreign to the native nature. Chastity is a national virtue. In five years there have been imposed but two death-penalties. A witness, however, is imprisoned if he neglects to obey the oral summons of the court. It is surprising how soon a "wanted" individual can be produced, even from the most distant parts of the country. The boundaries are as well policed as the capital, and, in the words of a resident, "not a fly can move anywhere without the Prince's knowing it." The prisoners enjoy a good deal of freedom. With the slack of their heavy leg-chains pulled up by a cord from the belt, they not only leave their cells, but emerge from the main gate and promenade a sort of parade ground outside, where, chatting with friends and amusing themselves cheerfully, they form a picturesque addition to the town.

The scene in the court-room is even more striking. If you can get the trick of breathing the peculiarly "racy" atmosphere, where ventilation is evidently sniffed at, you can quite enjoy yourself. The dense crowd of spectators at the bottom of the long narrow room is in itself a fine study. Every one wears the highly interesting national costume right up to the little red and black "pill-box" cap, which is ubiquitous, worn by men, women, and children alike. Inside the rail there seems to be a normal state of excitement. Talk as loud and as often as possible, and always interrupt everybody, is evidently the first rule of procedure. At times one would almost think the Dreyfus trial had been somehow translated from Rennes to Cettinje. As a matter of fact, the general run of cases consists of small commercial disputes, for your Montenegrin is a thrifty soul, and follows his florins and kreutzers as keenly as a Yankee his dollars and cents. The handling of witnesses is a delicate matter. There is a Celtic strain in the national character that crops out in a tendency to exaggeration and agreeable misstatement, to which generations of strategic warfare have added a crafty indirectness, while a fierce pride and an extremely sensitive dignity do not tend to make things easier. At the upper end of the room, under an execrable crayon portrait of the Prince, is the judges' table. They are hale and hearty old fellows, whose importance is easily seen from their attire, even more brilliant than the usual dress of the country. They give no written opinions, and are consequently not overburdened by citations or precedents. Indeed, their decisions are apt to be affected not only by the state of the weather and their digestions, but by the rank and influence of the claimant. So we fall back on the Prince, as usual, and we cannot wonder at the passionate devotion in which he is everywhere held when we see how he shepherds his people through all their tribulations, and not least through the pitfalls of the law. But after a visit to the court-room we understand why he preferred to dispense his judgments out in the open, beneath the shade of the ancient tree of justice.

SAMUEL F. BATCHELDER.

Correspondence.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of January 31 I find a letter of rather paternal advice to would-be candidates for positions at Stanford University. My first impression was one of amusement, it suggesting the salutary truth embodied in the homely old English proverb, "Proffred servyce stynketh." My final impression, however, was one of indignation, and of astonishment at the spirit of the letter, at its officious attitude and its tone, at its logic, and at its "historical method." After a strong warning, and a good deal of rather disagreeable innuendo, after such strong statements as the one which declares "the acceptance of a Stanford position in the highest degree indecorous," the writer closes with a "however," and the confession that "the evidence of the case is not yet accessible." As an historical scholar, I am accustomed to get the evidence first and to give my verdict afterwards, and not to begin by giving judgment and end with a doubt about its basis.

As you opened your columns to this officious "warning," I trust you will be glad to publish a word from another quarter. Let me then reply; and I do this not as an older member of the Stanford faculty, but as an academic scholar of European training, who has taught at a German university (Leipzig) before he was called to Stanford, and a man with full opportunities for observation, a man who flatters himself that he knows pretty well what university freedom means in the Old World as well as the New. Let me state emphatically that *I* have never found academic freedom endangered here in any department, in any direction, in any degree. To me (and, as I stated above, I have been a quiet observer of this and other American universities) Stanford has always appeared a very stronghold of *liberty* (*not license*), and I think the character of its President as well as that of the greater part of its faculty should be a sufficient guarantee to younger men that no impairment of academic liberty is at all likely to occur.

The "Evidence of the Ross Case," and the evidence from both sides, has recently been gathered and weighed by a special committee of Stanford alumni, carefully and calmly—a committee, let me add, the ma-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jority of which had at first been deceived by the newspaper and other gossip, and believed that "the right of free speech had been restricted at the University"; and the result of this investigation is that "the action of Mrs. Stanford (representing the Board of Trustees) in asking the dismissal of Professor Ross involved no infringement of free speech." So the paternal advice in your columns may have been extremely well meant (it professes to have been given "very unwillingly"), but it is unwarranted, not in accordance with the actual facts, and unfriendly as well as unwise.

Having found so much fault with the article in question, I am glad to state that I heartily agree with the author in one point, and that is the counsel (as wise as it is old) to would-be candidates "to be quite sure that they know what they are about"!—Yours truly, EWALD FLÜGEL.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, February 5, 1901.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In view of the communications which have appeared in the *Nation* relative to the recent affairs at Stanford University, I wish to ask that the following report and statement be published. The report is taken from the *Daily Palo Alto* (January 29), one of the student publications:

The committee appointed by the San Francisco alumni to interview the parties concerned in the Ross affair and obtain, if possible, the confidential facts in the matter, made its report at a meeting of the alumni last Saturday night [January 26]. The men of the committee have seen every one they believed could give information in the matter, members of the University and outsiders, about twelve in all, and have received the confidence of both sides of the case, gathering a mass of testimony on which they have been at work for over two months. The committee confined itself strictly to the principle involved in Mrs. Stanford's action, and her motives have been carefully analyzed. Its decision is given additional weight by the admitted fact that when the committee was appointed, a majority of its members believed that the right of free speech had been restricted in the University. The report is as follows:

"Your committee elected at the meeting of the association held November 20, 1900, to ascertain the confidential and other reasons for Dr. Ross's enforced resignation begs leave to report:

" 'That inasmuch as those interviewed, on both sides, have stipulated that the detailed information received should be treated as confidential, your committee is able to report only the ultimate facts.

" 'These are as follows:

" 'First—Mrs. Stanford shared in the opinion general in university circles in 1896 that Dr. Ross's pamphlet entitled "An Honest Dollar," illustrated by political cartoons, signed by him as "Professor of Economics in the Leland Stanford Jr. University," and published and circulated by one of the political parties during the campaign of that year, was undignified in its form and manner of treatment, and that it was unwise in the point of the time and manner of its publication, because jeopardizing the University's right to a reputation for political non-partisanship. This incident, together with Dr. Ross's general conduct throughout that campaign, was deemed by Mrs. Stanford a symptom of unfitness for the responsible position of head of the economics department of the University.

" 'Second—The justness of the criticism then expressed must be deemed to be conceded by Dr. Ross, since it has been admitted by him to your committee that he would not again pursue the same course under similar circumstances.

" 'Third—Your committee is unable to find that Mrs. Stanford's objection arose because Dr. Ross's opinion differed from her own, since it is in evidence that she had at that time no opinion upon either side of the particular financial theories then in issue, and since she has not abandoned her objection to his conduct in the campaign of 1896, although his views upon the silver question thereafter radically changed.

" 'Fourth—That from December, 1896, when Dr. Ross's chair was changed from economics to social science, until the time of his dismissal his position in the University was probational.

" 'Fifth—That the want of confidence engendered by the incidents of 1896 was never removed from Mrs. Stanford's mind, but was accentuated by other incidents impairing her faith in his good taste and discretion. Among these your committee has found: The use of slang in his public and classroom lectures, brought to her attention by friends present, and by lampoons in the college annuals, and reports that his classroom lectures contained references derogatory to her deceased husband.

" 'Sixth—Your committee has been unable to find any evidence that Mrs. Stanford ever took exceptions to Dr. Ross's economic teachings.

" 'Seventh—That her ultimate demand for his resignation was not due to opinions expressed in his speeches on "Coolie Immigration" and the "Twentieth Century City," but was because she deemed that her original estimate had proven correct, and that he was redisplaying, after three years of trial, those qualities found objectionable in the instance of her original action.

" 'In passing upon the question whether Mrs. Stanford's action involved any abridgment of the right of free speech, your committee has considered very carefully the published statement of Dr. Ross, and the proofs upon which it is founded. In deliberating upon these, however, your committee has been unable to escape the force of the following facts:

" 'First—Dr. Ross was not in the position of one able to remain in the University who chose to resign, but of one who, willing to remain, was forced to resign. His statement, therefore, necessarily attempted to tell Mrs. Stanford's reasons for forcing him out and not his own for going; hence it cannot have the probative force of his own reasons for his own acts.

" 'Second—Dr. Ross's statement ignores the criticism arising from his conduct during the campaign of 1896; notwithstanding that he knew at the time of publishing his statement that it was one of the operative reasons for his dismissal.

" 'Third—The established fact that Dr. Ross desired to remain at Stanford, notwithstanding Mrs. Stanford's criticism, is inconsistent with the theory that he really regarded those criticisms as involving any abridgment of his right of free speech.

" 'Fourth—The admission of Dr. Ross to your committee that he would not regard a university rule against the participation in politics by a university professor of economics during the progress of a political campaign as impairing the proper right of academic freedom, disposes of his contention that the criticism of his conduct in 1896 is capable of that construction.

" 'From the foregoing facts and upon the testimony as a whole, your committee concludes that the action of Mrs. Stanford in asking the dismissal of Dr. Ross involved no infringement of the right of free speech.' "

Prof. Morton A. Aldrich resigned immediately upon the withdrawal of Dr. Ross, and before all the facts of the case could possibly have been known to him. If I mistake not, it was on the morning following the announcement of Dr. Ross's withdrawal that Dr. Howard criticised the action and the motives of the University management before his students. The facts were not then forthcoming for a judicial consideration of the matter, and the time was not conducive to a dispassionate judgment. It is without doubt quite true that soon after this Dr. Jordan informed Dr. Howard that he did not wish him to resign, and that he should not ask for his resignation unless Mrs. Stanford demanded it. But it seems to me quite probable that, upon further consideration, it was seen that such an action could not be allowed to stand—that by its silence the University management could not give its sanction to such a breach of propriety. At least we have the word of Dr. Jordan and Dr. Branner that Mrs. Stanford knew nothing of Dr. Howard's resignation until after it had taken place. On January 10 Dr. Howard was asked for an apology or his resignation. He resigned.

Three other members of the faculty also resigned. One of them acknowledged that he had been considering the severance of his connection with the University for more than a year, for personal reasons; the other two acknowledged that they were largely influenced by their personal friendship for Dr. Howard. So the merits of the controversy were not the sole factors in these cases.

Great as is the loss to the University of Dr. Howard, there can be only one side to the question of his action. That side has been stated clearly by Dr. Branner, who, as the acting President, accepted the last three resignations. In a communication to the *Daily Palo Alto*, Dr. Branner said:

"It would appear, from many of the statements heard and seen of late, that the position of this University with reference to the conduct, privileges, and opinions of members of its faculty is totally different from that of any other institution in this country. I recognize the fact that every one connected with or interested in the institution is entitled to know what principles govern its management. Permit me to clear away the fog that seems to have gathered round the subject, and so to state the University's position that I trust there can be no possible misunderstanding it.

"The question at issue in the case of Dr. Howard is simply this: Are the professors in this institution at liberty to arraign the University management in the presence of their classes? If such a liberty is looked upon as academic freedom, then I beg to say once for all that such freedom (if that be the word) is not and will not be tolerated in this institution so long as it is under its present management. There is nothing new about this position; it is no new policy, but it has been assumed from the outset that every one recognized the utter impossibility of university existence under any other condition. There are here, as there are elsewhere, proper channels through which all disagreements can be adjusted without overstepping the bounds of official courtesy and propriety. Where affairs which concern the faculty or the students, either directly or indirectly, either individually or collectively, require or seem to require modification of any kind, it is the duty and the pleasure of the President to hear and consider every complaint and every suggestion, and every one acquainted with him knows that no man is more accessible than President Jordan."

There are still some one hundred and forty members of the Stanford faculty left, and though it may be true that some of them have been restrained from resigning their positions because of inadequate financial means, there are many who are not so unfortunately situated, and who have given not only a silent support to the University throughout the recent troubles, but open support. It seems to me that the balance of testimony is decidedly in favor of the University administration. ALUMNUS.

February 5, 1901.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ACADEMIC SOLIDARITY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Allow me to add another illustration to your discussion on the lack of solidarity among university professors. In the February number of the *Cosmopolitan* magazine appeared an article on "Scientific Joy," signed with the full name of a professor of Columbia University. The object of it is to hold up to public ridicule an experimental study of the pleasant emotions, carried on in the Harvard Psychological Laboratory. A student, Mr. D., asked certain students how they should feel if they should get large sums of money, and their descriptions of their joy were recorded. These records of an imaginary joy are made to furnish amusement for the gallery, and adorned with a grotesque illustration in black and white. But the wildly humorous article finally becomes serious:

"These three valuable facts were discovered by the psychologists of Harvard University after the long and interesting series of experiments. . . . Experiments like this, conducted gravely in the laboratories of the oldest of American universities, watched over and recorded by learned men, and published for the information of the world at large, serve as an illustration of how much sheer tomfoolery is permitted to encroach upon and to discredit our university training," etc., etc.

The facts are these: (1.) D.'s paper on Joy was, as the *Cosmopolitan* writer knows, not published as a Harvard paper, but as a doctor's thesis of Columbia University, and accepted for the degree by the faculty to which the author himself belongs.

(2.) The only experiments which D. describes in his Columbia thesis as "carried out in the Psychological Laboratory of Harvard throughout the college year 1895-6 and 1897-98" have nothing whatever to do with that imaginary bank-account, but deal solely with "involuntary motor reactions to pleasant and unpleasant stimuli," the stimuli being not dollar bills but colored lights, tactual stimulations, odors, and sounds. The whole extensive investigation was scientific and important, and I gladly take the responsibility for the thousands of experiments included therein. These the *Cosmopolitan* does not mention at all.

(3.) The ridiculed record on imaginative financial joy was in no way a part of D.'s university work; no instructor had any responsibility for it or any previous knowledge of it, and if some students of the Psychological Laboratory took part in it, it was their private amusement. The whole thing, which is said to have filled "the best part of a year," was probably carried out in less than two hours. When D. told me later about it, I referred to it laughingly as an absurdity. On the other hand, I found it quite correct that my friend Cattell of Columbia accepted the thesis as it stands, since this useless little private inquiry of D.'s is fully balanced by the real scientific value of the scholarly experiments which D. made for two years under my direction at Harvard, and for one year under Professor Cattell in Columbia.

We have thus the fact that a Columbia professor finds in a Columbia thesis the valuable scientific work which a man has carried on for two years at Harvard, and a few objectionable private inquiries which he made while he was a student there. He ignores the entire serious work of those two years, and implies that the impromptu side-inquiry was the whole paper. He ignores the private character of that episode, and pretends that such objectionable inquiries can form here at Harvard the chief part of the official occupation of a student of psychology; he ignores the relation of the publication to his own university, and makes the reader believe that it was published under the responsibility of a Harvard professor. And while this misbehavior of the Harvard professor has to him "a very serious side," he uses to expose it not a serious paper where discussion is possible, but the *Cosmopolitan*, where the earnest address to the director of the Harvard Psychological Laboratory is accompanied by the funny picture of an idiotic professor. If a "colleague" can so conduct himself and can sign his full name, thus evidently feeling that he need not fear the overwhelming indignation of the academic public, then the ideas of professional honor among university men must indeed be still deplorably undeveloped.

Hugo Münsterberg.

Harvard University, February 6, 1901.

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATING.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the *Nation* for January 31 attention was called to an "unverified rumor" that, in some colleges, students preparing for intercollegiate debating contests are receiving an undue amount of assistance from members of the faculty. The writer deplores the element of unfairness thus introduced into such contests, and ends by calling for an authoritative statement from colleges interested, defining their position in the matter.

That faculty coaching, where it exceeds the help that may legitimately be given to students engaged in any investigation outside their regular college work, is an unmitigated evil, there can of course be no question. Undoubtedly it is in the highest degree pernicious to the best interests of intercollegiate debating. While not caring to hazard an opinion as to the prevalence of this abuse, I would merely call attention to the fact that it is not the only abuse, nor by any means the worst of those which the friends of fair debating deprecate. Another of these abuses, which it seems to me so far eclipses in its deleterious influence that mentioned by your former correspondent as to make the evil of faculty coaching appear relatively insignificant, deserves at least passing notice. I refer to the form of subsidizing which obtains in many institutions, by which the debaters are given credit for work done in preparation for the debate. By such a system, these institutions make no distinction between work done in preparing for a debating contest and that done by men pursuing the regular courses of the college curriculum. Nor is this the worst feature of such a system. The credit allowed for such work is, at least in several colleges of the middle West, out of all proportion to its educational value. I speak only of that which has come under my personal observation when I say that in one of these "colleges" credit is given to the men who compose the team for no less than four hours per week, and to those who enter the preliminary contest, but who are not finally chosen to represent the college in the intercollegiate contest, two hours per week, during the half year in which the debate occurs. In another of these institutions, the conditions are the same, except that, in the case of the four men finally chosen to represent the college, six hours per week are credited instead of four. In this connection it is to be noted that the preparation for the debate occupies, at most, only two months.

The unfairness resultant upon such a system is at once manifest. Once entered upon, it follows logically that if the faculty is to allow work done in preparation for a debate to count towards the obtaining of a degree, the members of the faculty must exercise a careful supervision over that preparation. Hence it becomes apparent that the evil of faculty coaching is herein necessarily involved. Moreover, since this custom of subsidizing is not universal, fair competition between a college which practises it and one which does not countenance it, becomes impossible. How can students who are doing a full amount of work outside their preparation for the debate compete on equal terms with men two-fifths of whose required work has been remitted?

Clearly the time is ripe, as your correspondent suggests, for "an authoritative statement as to the actual practice of the institutions represented in intercollegiate debates." A Friend of Fair Debating.

BUCKLE AND TONGUE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The expression "make strap and buckle meet," used in the article on "The Proposed Bank Tax," in No. 1857 of the *Nation*, recalls to my mind an expression of the same idea which has, for many years, been current in the eastern part of North Carolina. This expression is, "to make buckle and tongue meet," the tongue being the leather strap which is caught by the buckle. G. S. W.

February 6, 1901.

SAMUEL SWARTWOUT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In your article entitled "Tammany in History" in the *Nation* of February 7, 1901, you charge, and no doubt very justly, many frauds to Tammany Hall. In one point, however, you greatly err, viz., in stating that "Sachem Swartwout," meaning, I presume, Mr. Samuel Swartwout, received unjustly $1,250,000. Though I had the honor and pleasure of knowing Mr. Swartwout only as a lad may know an elderly gentleman, I have been in the position of knowing somewhat about his private life. A more truly honorable, honest man probably never lived in this country. He had, however, the great misfortune of always having about him men who pretended to be his friends, for their own purposes. When, as Collector of the Port of New York, he was accused of embezzling large sums, he had not received one dollar. He wished to stand up and demand a fair investigation. This, however, his "friends" did not permit. He was persuaded to go to Europe, and leave the United States Government to do as it saw fit. Naturally, there was nothing for it to do but to take judgment by default.

Later he went to the Secretary of the Treasury and told him that he (Mr. Swartwout) had property of which the Government knew nothing nor could ascertain any-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing, but which he would surrender if a fair trial were granted to him. The property was accepted, but the trial never granted. Thus has Mr. Swartwout's name been handed down as of one who had defrauded his country. His wife, whom I remember well, told me that, when returning from Europe, she was not allowed by her husband even to enter free of duty the shawl which she was at the time actually wearing.

In justice to one who has no descendants to defend his name, kindly correct the error as far as you can, and thus oblige

Very faithfully yours,

JOHN HENRY LIVINGSTON.

CLERMONT, N. Y., February 9, 1901.

[Our correspondent will not object to our making a brief extract from Swartwout's letter to Jesse Hoyt (March 14, 1829) when both were seeking office of Jackson, Swartwout with his eye on the collectorship. We cite Parton's Jackson, vol iii., p. 211.—ED. NATION.]

"I hold to your doctrine fully, that no d—d rascal who made use of his office or its profits for the purpose of keeping Mr. Adams in and General Jackson out of power, is entitled to the least lenity or mercy, save that of hanging. So we think both alike on that head. Whether or not I shall get anything in the general scramble for plunder, remains to be proven; but I rather guess I shall. What it will be is not yet so certain; perhaps keeper of the Bergen lighthouse. . . . I know Mr. Ingham slightly, and would recommend you to push like a devil if you expect anything from that quarter. I can do you no good in any quarter of the world. . . . I've got the bots, the fet-lock, hip-joint, gravel, halt, and founders; and I assure you if I can only keep my own legs, I shall do well; but I'm darned if I can carry any weight with me."

Notes.

Cassell & Co. announce 'Campaign Pictures of the War in South Africa, 1899-1900,' by A. G. Hales, special correspondent of the London *Daily News;* '"The Shop"; The Story of the Royal Military Academy,' by Capt. Guggisberg, R. E.; 'Chinese Pictures: Notes on Photographs Made in China,' by Mrs. J. F. Bishop; and an 'Encyclopædia of the Game of Whist,' by Sir William Cusack-Smith.

M. F. Mansfield & Co., who are soon to issue the first number of a *Book-Plate Quarterly,* have in press 'Recollections of a Georgia Loyalist,' by Elizabeth Lichtenstein Johnston, edited by the Rev. Arthur Wentworth Eaton; 'New Glimpses of Poe,' by Prof. James A. Harrison of the University of Virginia; 'Stevensoniana Series'; 'First Visit to England,' a reprint from Emerson's 'English Traits,' with portraits of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Landor, Carlyle, and others; and 'An Englishman's Love Letters.'

'The Painters of Florence,' by Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady), will be published directly by E. P. Dutton & Co.

Brentano's have nearly ready 'Our Fate and the Zodiac,' by Margaret Mayo, and 'The Story of Sarah,' by Miss Foster.

A quarto of 150 pages consisting of selections from Marcus Aurelius, Bacon, and Franklin will form the next luxurious product of the Cranbrook Press, Detroit, Mich.

Orders for the 'Mega Lexikon' of the Greek Languge, a work based on Liddell & Scott, but filling four large quarto volumes, of which the first is set down for April, will be placed with advantage before March 15 with Lemcke & Buechner, No. 812 Broadway, as after that date the price will be enhanced by nearly fifty per cent. The preparation of the work is complete.

Tycho Brahe, as is well known, during his stay at Wandsbeck in 1598, superintended the printing of an especial edition of his celebrated work entitled 'Astronomiæ Instauratæ Mechanica.' It was done in his own office by Philip von Ohr, and is now extremely rare; Dr. Dreyer, in his recently issued Life of Tycho, mentioning but four copies as known to be extant—two at Copenhagen, one in the British Museum, and one at Prague. To these a fifth must be added, which is to be found in the library of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Stockholm—a copy in splendid binding, and which was doubtless presented by its distinguished author to some royal personage of that day. As compared with the very inferior edition printed in 1602 by Hulzius at Nuremberg, the Stockholm copy is one of great beauty; and the Royal Academy, in anticipation of the coming tercentenary of Tycho's death, on October 24, is already printing a facsimile edition, neatly photolithographed from the original. Would-be subscribers to this important work should communicate with Dr. B. Hasselberg, Fellow of the Royal Academy, Stockholm, before March 15; the price of it has been fixed at £2. Tycho is recognized the world over as the founder of modern practical astronomy, and a special committee of the Academy is arranging a celebration of the day by a festival session. The publication of his 'Astronomiæ' on this occasion will form a lasting memorial that will be appreciated by astronomers everywhere.

The thin quarto volume, 'The Shakspere Country, Illustrated,' by John Leyland (London: George Newnes; New York: Scribners), is not remarkable for literary skill or flavor, but contains an attractive assortment of photographic and other depictions of scenery and persons relating to Stratford, Warwick, and Kenilworth; with Shakspere, his houses and associations, for the central interest. The work recommends itself to Americans further by views not only of the American memorial fountain at Stratford, of Washington Irving's room at the Red Horse Inn, of the John Harvard house, but also of Sulgrave Manor-house, the ancient home of the Washingtons, and of Sulgrave Church, which holds the headless effigy of Laurence Washington (died 1564).

Modern chemists foresee a time when science shall be able so to condense the nutritious properties of aliments that a single capsule will contain a dinner, and a traveller may carry a week's rations in his waistcoat pocket. Publishers have already achieved something of the sort in the numerous anthologies and chrestomathies that profess to give us the essences of all literatures distilled into a few duodecimos. We are not implying disapproval, but simply note the fact. The "Warwick Library" devotes each volume to illustrating some special form of English Literature; that before us—'English Satires,' by Oliphant Smeaton (London: Blackie & Son; New York: Scribners)—containing representative extracts from the satirists from Chaucer and Langland to Browning and Thackeray, preceded by a well-written introduction. A few errors of consequence occur. For instance, the line in Donne's fourth satire, "Mine? As you see, I have but one," is printed, "Mine, eyes you see, I have but one." The last sentence in Johnson's famous letter to Lord Chesterfield is stultified (as usual) by the use of a full stop instead of a comma after "exultation."

Dr. Joyce has given us another of his charming handbooks concerning Ireland, 'A Reading-Book in Irish History' (Longmans). Young and old alike will be interested by it. Prose and poetry intermingle pleasantly. Views of fairy hills, raths, castles, and churches, alternate with cuts of weapons and implements. From shadowy mythical times we are led on to the end of the fifteenth century. The xlixth and last chapter is "On Ancient Irish Music," and difficulties likely to suggest themselves to the minds of young people are explained in a few pages of notes. We do not often find within the limits of 212 openly printed small-sized pages so much of solid information pleasantly imparted. Beyond self-respecting love of country, no bias, political or religious, shows itself.

We are always hearing something new. According to Mr. T. Dunbar Ingram ('A Critical Examination of Irish History,' 2 vols., Longmans), "The sensitiveness of the English conscience is wonderful, even pathetic. It is for ever seeking reasons for self-depreciation and self-condemnation. An Englishman is [A. D. 1900] no longer right in his own eyes, and self-confidence has deserted his breast. Doubtful of his own uprightness and bewailing his shortcomings, he calls in question the conduct and policy of his forefathers. . . . In his humility and self-denunciation, he is willing to forget that he is come of a people who have ever been distinguished by their piety, integrity, humanity," etc., etc. Especially concerning Ireland it appears that many evil-disposed persons (prominent among whom is one William H. Lecky) have of late years contributed to this morbid conscientiousness and undue self-depreciation. Mr. Ingram (we must not confuse him with the author of 'Who Fears to Speak of '98?') has lent himself to the task of reëstablishing English self-respect. He proves, to his own satisfaction at least, that England's treatment of Ireland has been "all that's honest, honorable, and fair"; that Sir John Temple little if at all exaggerates the horrors of "The Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Massacres" of 1641, and that the Irish Parliament of 1782 was "the most worthless and incompetent assembly that ever misgoverned a country." Such volumes as these have their use. We may scarcely care to add them to our private libraries; but they set us thinking concerning the bases of our ordinary historical beliefs. And these, from the pen of one of the leaders of the Irish ascendancy Protestant minority, through the spirit that animates every line, go far to explain the underlying reasons of an Irish question being ever present with us.

The '*Times* History of the War in South Africa' is likely to be the most elaborate undertaking in the field. The Scribners, as representatives of Sampson Low, Marston & Co., London, send us the first volume of the projected five. It is to be hoped that the unhappy struggle will have become matter of history before the fifth appears. The work is a compilation for which L. S.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Amery, fellow of All Souls, Oxford, assumes the editorial responsibility. The present volume treats Anglo-Boer relations to the beginning of the war. In tone, the book is moderate, and, while naturally pro-British, fairly impartial. The editor sees the moral obliquity of Rhodes the mining director, Rhodes the Premier, and Rhodes of the Chartered Company balancing interests at the cost of a war, but reaches the somewhat inconsequential conclusion that while all that Mr. Rhodes did was "unjustifiable," it was nowise inconsistent with honor. The actual firebrand was Dr. Jameson, the editor feels; Rhodes would have kept him "banked" till a more opportune time. The bulky volume, in its plain, red-cloth binding, is fitter for the shelves or study-table than for the hand. A map of South Africa folds into a pocket inside the front cover. There are numerous photogravure portraits, including a most picturesque plate of nine of the Boer generals in the war of 1881. Mr. Chamberlain's familiar portrait, though the author holds him absolutely blameless in the Jameson affair and relatively so throughout, comes to the fore very properly, those who believe him the evil genius of the whole unhappy business will maintain.

There is something disinterested in a childless man betaking himself to genealogical researches for the family name, and Mr. Rowland Rowell of Manchester, N. H., is entitled to so much praise for his 'Biographical Sketch of Samuel Rowell, and Notices of Some of his Descendants,' 1754-1898. It is otherwise, however, a meritorious labor, being quite unpretentious, and furnishing nearly seventy portraits (mostly but not all of Rowell blood), which fix the standing of the connection at a glance. It is a New England tribe of the middle class, with few notabilities, two of the best known being the late Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson, the philanthropist, and George P. Rowell of advertising fame. The genealogy begins with the author's great-grandfather, Samuel Rowell, of New Hampshire (1754-1830), a remarkable type of Revolutionary soldier, who served from Bunker Hill to Valley Forge and Quebec; a son of his enlisted in the war of 1812, and the third generation participated freely in the civil war. Samuel's wife was a great-granddaughter of Hannah Duston, celebrated in the history of Indian warfare and massacre. The early notices in this volume are readable, and reflect the familiar New England life of the time.

Three figures stand out prominently in the almost skeleton 'Genealogy of the Descendants of Edward Bates of Weymouth, Mass.' (South Baintree, Mass.: Frank A. Bates) —one the substantial founder of the family (1605-1686) from near Boston in Lincolnshire, whose will is given *in extenso;* the others Joshua Bates, the banker, of the house of Barings, and virtual founder of the Boston Public Library, and Samuel Austin Bates, who began the present work. Collateral descent here receives no attention, else we might have had the Weston sisters, nieces of Joshua Bates, commemorated (his elder sister Nancy having married Warren Weston). Among this remarkable group of women was Maria (Mrs. Henry Grafton Chapman), whose indispensable services to the anti-slavery cause are known to every reader of the Life of Garrison. She was also the friend and biographer of Harriet Martineau.

A very pretty thin volume, 'A Sketch of the Munro Clan' (Boston: George H. Ellis), is a light abstract, by James Phinney Munroe, of the late Alexander Mackenzie's 'History of the Munros' (1897), with some general account of the clan and its distinguished members, but more especially with a view to that William Munro who was the direct ancestor of all who have borne his name in Lexington, Mass. Visitors to that historic town have pointed out to them Munroe's Tavern, now a private residence, which became a hospital for the British wounded on the fateful April day in 1775. It was built in 1695 by William Munro of the second generation. The founder was made prisoner in the battle of Worcester in 1651, and deported to this country, landing in Boston. His descendants (he was twice married) have been numerous, with a liberal proportion of men of worth and prominence. Mr. J. P. Munroe penitentially adds a letter purporting to describe Washington's visit to Lexington in 1789, which he constructed in a true antiquarian spirit, but which has frequently been cited, to his annoyance, as an original contemporary document.

'Reservoirs for Irrigation, Water-Power, and Domestic Water-Supply,' by James Dix Schuyler (Wiley & Sons), is a large octavo of 414 pages, with 51 plates and maps, which treats mainly of water-works west of the Rocky Mountains. Owing to the high rate of interest in that region, engineers have been obliged to reduce the cost of plants to a minimum, and, in consequence, many novel and bold features of construction have there originated. Dams of loose rock with timber or concrete faces to prevent leakage, embankments made by causing the water of creeks to carry and deposit earth, and some masonry structures of unusual proportions are described in the book. The author has been prominently identified with hydraulic work on the Pacific Slope, and much of the matter of the volume has been collected by him for publication in the reports of the United States Geological Survey. This bureau is agitating and advocating plans whereby the Government shall not only build storage-reservoirs and irrigation works, but also carry on the business of operation and administration of such plants. The author is a strong advocate of this doubtful policy, for which, indeed, there seems to be little Constitutional warrant, and he even goes so far as to recommend that private capital should not be permitted to build reservoirs except under the most rigid Governmental supervision.

'The Cement Industry' (New York: The *Engineering Record*) contains detailed descriptions of eighteen cement manufactories in this country, with shorter accounts of sixteen plants in Europe. During the decade ending with 1900, the manufacture of Portland hydraulic cement in the United States increased more than ten-fold, owing to the introduction of horizontal rotary kilns, in place of the former vertical stationary kilns. In 1892 our total consumption of Portland cement was less than three million barrels, of which nearly eighty per cent. was imported; in 1899 the consumption exceeded seven million barrels, of which only thirty per cent. was imported. Of natural hydraulic cement the consumption has been quite uniform at about seven or eight million barrels per year. Cement, mortar, and concrete are now used to such an extent that perhaps the present century may become known as an age of concrete as the last half-century was an age of steel. Iron and steel bridges have but a short life in consequence of wear and corrosion, but stone and concrete bridges are largely unaffected by atmospheric influences, and have a solidity which is lacking in metal structures.

Volume iv. of the 'Text-Book of the Embryology of Invertebrates,' by Dr. E. Korschelt and Dr. K. Heider, translated from the German by Matilda Bernard, revised and edited with additional notes by Martin F. Woodward (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan), contains the Amphineura, Lamellibranchia, Solenoconcha, Gastropoda, Cephalopoda, Tunicata, and Cephalochorda, and completes one of the most important publications on the invertebrata. Translating and editing have been carefully done, and, though some years have passed since the appearance of the German edition, the work has been brought tolerably well up to date by means of additional notes, especially so in the section relating to the mollusca, the author's specialty. The text is rendered much as left by the authors, and in the case of conclusions that have been modified by recent works the student is referred to the notes. The entire work is one of the utmost value to such as study or teach the subjects traversed. The authors have been careful, so far as possible, to bring the facts into prominence, without committing themselves too far with regard to theories or speculations. Their cautious treatment of theoretical matters may be illustrated by the final statement of this volume, concerning forms of invertebrates from which the vertebrates are supposed by some to have been derived. The origin of the vertebrates is lost in the obscurity of forms unknown to us.

The southern universities of France, Grenoble, Aix, Montpellier, and other towns are engaged in an interesting movement to foster the study of Italian, with a view to the culture of French students, and with the more ambitious intention of removing, by better knowledge, the mutual misunderstandings between the nations. One expression of this movement is a school edition of Ariosto by Prof. Raymond Bonafus of the University of Aix. It follows the sensible programme of the "Collection Dejob," of which it is the latest volume. An introduction of some sixty pages sets forth the life and literary significance of the poet; abundant notes explain textual difficulties, obscure allusions, etc., or warn the young reader to stop and think a bit ("de lire moins vite, de réfléchir") over passages the special beauty of which might escape him; finally, the links between the extracts are supplied in terse prose narrative. Thus something that is tedious and more that is scabrous is represented by the editor's decorous prose. The 'Orlando Furioso,' so treated, covers 276 pages; the 'Satires,' and two of the comedies even, are similarly represented by extract. The utility of the book for advanced classes in Italian is evident; the older reader will probably prefer to deal with a complete text and be his own extractor and expurgator.

In a brief tribute to the memory of Friedrich Nietzsche, "So solltet ihr Nietzsche verstehen" (in the *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* for January 5), Frau Prof. Wanda Bartels tells of her and her husband's chance acquaintance with the famous thinker during a sojourn in Venice. She dwells

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the contrast of his own modest reserve and unassuming ways with those of the blustering youths who flaunt in public as his followers and believers in his "system"; for he had no system, and "did not write to teach the immmature, but to free his own soul." Frau Bartels's protest calls to mind the more weighty and truly enlightening utterances of another personal friend of Nietzsche, Prof. Paul Deussen of Kiel, who, writing in the *Wiener Rundschau* for October 15, on the "Truth about Friedrich Nietzsche," discusses with great clearness the two cardinal points of Nietzsche's doctrine, viz., the *Uebermensch* and the *ewige Wiederkehr*, or eternal repetition of the world-process. The former, Professor Deussen holds, is an ideal of humanity which, in essential points, coincides with the Christ of the Church; and when Nietzsche insists that the man within us must be overcome in order that the *Uebermensch* may arise, he preaches what all great moralists and religious teachers have preached. Nietzsche errs in his conception of the nature of the "negation of the will" and in substituting genius for morality (or the intellect for the will) as the means of attaining to an ideal humanity.

It is a matter of no slight interest to all students and admirers of the great Swabian poets that the construction of the long contemplated Schiller-Archiv in Marbach is at last to be carried to completion. According to a communication from Stuttgart to the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, the general committee of the Swabian Schiller-Verein met on December 29 for final action on the recommendations of the special commission on the construction of the building. The recommendations of this committee are, in brief, that the plans submitted by the successful firm of Eisenlohr & Weigle in the prize competition be accepted with slight modification, and that the construction of the building be begun at once. The association already owns the necessary land, and has in its treasury some 220,000 marks available for construction. The old Schiller monument is to remain in its present position, and, in fact, the new plans are to be completed with as little change in the old surroundings as is necessary. The total cost of the new structure is estimated at about 212,000 marks. The general committee adopted all the recommendations of the commission on construction, and work will be begun immediately. It is hoped that the building will be completed by the summer of 1902. Among the delegates present at the meeting was the Baroness Mathilde von Schiller, widow of the poet's grandson.

Sophus Schandorph, who died at his home in Frederiksberg, near Copenhagen, on January 1, 1901, was perhaps the most thoroughly Danish of the Scandinavian authors of this generation. No one else has had so firm a grasp on the Danish peasantry of Seeland. In his personality as well as in his writings he typified the genial southern nature, which is in so striking contrast to the fjeld seriousness of the Norwegian. Schandorph was born at Ringsted, May 4, 1837. After studying theology, which he soon found was not to his taste, he devoted himself to Romance philology, taking the doctor's degree for a dissertation on the Italian writers Gozzi and Goldoni. For several years he gave lessons in French and Italian in Copenhagen. But as his reputation as a writer of fiction gradually increased after the appearance of his first important book, 'From the Province,' 1876, which showed the strong influence of the new school of Brandes, he gradually gave his attention more and more to pure literature. In 1880 he received a fixed stipend from the Government, and from that time until shortly before his death his literary productiveness was uninterrupted. Schandorph excelled in a broad, sympathetic treatment of two main types, the peasant and the provincial town folk. In his limitations as well as in his excellences he suggests Dickens: his attempts to depict Copenhagen high life resulted chiefly in caricatures. Among his most successful books may be mentioned 'Without Centre' (1878), 'The Story of Thomas Friis' (1881), his longest novel, and 'The Old Apothecary Shop' (1885). Special mention should be made of his short stories, whose frequent coarseness is relieved only by their exquisite humor and robustness. His last novel, published less than a year before his death, was 'Helga.'

—The *Atlantic* for February has an article by Goldwin Smith, on Lord Rosebery's "Last Phase of Napoleon," which is a good deal better than the book itself. Lord Rosebery, in his boyish way, discusses the question whether Napoleon was a "good" man, and, remarks that he was not a Wilberforce, nor a St. Francis, nor a Washington, nor a Marcus Aurelius; what he says really shows that the true question is, not whether Napoleon was good, but how bad he was. The sum of our knowledge on this subject is that he was, as Mr. Smith says, "utterly unscrupulous," and stuck at nothing to accomplish his end. We must confess that, to our minds, the interest of the "last phase" of Napoleon is much impaired by the fact that an atmosphere of lies envelops it as a fog. John Fiske contributes some agreeable reminiscences of Huxley, at whose house he was a constant visitor and on terms of friendly intimacy. The article gives a clear account of the contributions of Huxley to science, and ranks him as a biological discoverer, in the department of classification, "foremost among the successors of the mighty Cuvier." The classification of animal genera is, through his contributions, wholly different from what it was before his time. J. K. Paulding has a paper, called "A Plea for New York," in which he urges us to "love her if we can," for "if we cannot, there is danger lest, lacking soil in which to spread our roots, we end by withering in those higher attributes that bring to bloom in the individual the blossom of the race." We doubt very much whether this consideration is operative in many minds, or whether it is worth while to bother ourselves very much as to whether we love our metropolis or not. From this article and also from one on "The Essence of American Humor" a foreigner would infer that we are still thinking too much about ourselves to be entirely unprovincial. As a matter of fact, New York, like other capitals, is loved most warmly by those on whom she showers honors and distinction, and helps to rise in the world. The toughs of whom she makes mayors, the bosses who are enabled by law to enrich themselves at her expense, the runners in the "red-light" district, are enthusiastic for New York, and violently resent all disparagement of her. But it is not for this class that Mr. Paulding writes.

—"Humor and Pathos of the Savings Bank," by Richard Boughton, is the title of the leading illustrated article in the *Century*. Mr. Boughton's estimate is that two-thirds of the depositors in savings-banks are weekly wage-earners—a fact which throws an interesting light on the perpetually renewed attempt to tax them in some way or other. A theory cultivated by politicians on the lookout for new sources of revenue is, that there are in these banks millions of "unclaimed deposits," which should by rights "revert" to the State. Mr. Boughton shows that there is no such fund. A legislative committee which, years ago, investigated the matter, reported that out of $65,000,000 on deposit, less than $90,000 was open to the suspicion of being unclaimed; at present the deposits alleged to be unclaimed are perhaps $1,500,000 out of $1,000,000,000. But even this sum is not really "unclaimed"; it belongs to depositors who, for some reason, have confidence that money once in a savings bank can always be found there. One case is mentioned of a depositor who called for his money for the first time some seventy years after it had been deposited. Jonas Stadling, in another illustrated article, gives an account of "The People at the Top of the World," whose acquaintance he made in connection with the search for Andrée. The search expedition to which this paper, and one to follow, relate was Nordenskiöld's promoted by the Geographical Society of Stockholm. Mr. Stadling and his companions proceeded overland to Yakutsk, and thence sailed down the Lena to its mouth, where the present narrative begins. The Lena delta is not the most interesting part of the globe, but the human drama goes on there. At Bulun, a village of forty houses, lives Sannikoff, of whom the local saying is, "God in heaven, the Czar in St. Petersburg, and Sannikoff in Bulun." The poor natives, by means of advances of money or otherwise, are kept in debt to the merchants, who treat them as slaves. Amelia Gere Mason, author of 'Women of the French Salons,' contributes a lively paper called "Is Sentiment Declining?" Sentiment is such a very comprehensive term that we crave a definition before we can say whether it is declining. "Intellectualized emotion," "emotion precipitated as it were in pretty crystals by the fancy," are quotations here given from Lowell; "the imagination of the heart" is added by the writer of this paper—all of which is pretty, but elusive. Perhaps on the whole, as with wit and humor, it is better to let definition alone. We all know, or ought to know, what sentiment is when we meet with it, whether in life or literature, and few will quarrel with the main idea of the paper, viz., that while our grandfathers and grandmothers cultivated it—overmuch, perhaps—we are strenuously endeavoring to expel it. Our resources for this purpose are endless. "Realism," violence, brutality, sensationalism, strenuousness, all play their part, and, last but not least, the so-called humor of the "cynic devil" whom Kipling has observed lurking about.

—*Harper's* contains an article by Sidney Whitman, on Franz von Lenbach, illustrated by interesting reproductions of his portraits of Bismarck, Leo XIII., and Gladstone. Mr. Whitman is one of the few English writers of the present day who care enough about Germany to be able to fall

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into the German way of looking at things. It seems that Lenbach's objection to Gladstone was that he had no humor, and was a sort of lay priest. He quotes Döllinger as saying (apropos of the English statesman's ravenous zeal in acquisition) that after the two had talked politics and theology from six o'clock until two o'clock in the morning, he, Döllinger, went to the library to fetch a book which had some bearing on the conversation. Coming back after a few minutes, Gladstone was found deep in the study of another book which he had pulled out of his pocket while waiting, "so as not to waste time." The view taken of him here supplements that to be found in Huxley's memoirs. Those who like other people's love-letters are in luck just now. Those of Bismarck are added by this magazine to Victor Hugo's. They are selected, translated, and annotated by Marrion Wilcox, and illustrated by portraits of Bismarck and Johanna von Puttkamer, whom he married. They are characteristic of the man, and at the opposite pole from the romantic effusions of Hugo, as also, by the way, from the erotically commonplace 'Love-Letters of an Englishwoman.' The correspondence opens with two letters: one, full of penitence for the errors of his wasted youth, to his fiancée; the other, designed to propitiate his prospective father-in-law, is devoted to religion. Bismarck had been, it seems, a skeptic, or agnostic, in such matters, and had placed his reliance on conscience as a guide; but this attitude of mind produced "disconsolate depression," until in Moritz Blanckenburg he first found a friend (apparently also a confidant) through whom he acquired faith. He admits that he has felt this emotion only for two months, but evidently thinks, and rightly, that his suit has, under these circumstances, better prospects of success than it would otherwise have possessed. Mr. Howells, in the "Easy Chair," has some more reflections on American manners, in which he expresses the opinion that, but for the great "American joke," and the humor it fosters, "our vulgarities might some time be too much for us." He instances a "Trilby Social" lately held in New Jersey, at which a ladies' foot auction was held, each pair being shown beneath a curtain, and auctioned off to members of the church; the proceeds being devoted to paying the church debt.

—*Scribner's* has several articles of interest. Henry Norman's fourth instalment of his "Russia of To-day" brings him to Bokhara, as yet not Russianized. The Amir, it seems, is still able to celebrate his visits to his capital by having the throats of a dozen prisoners cut in the open bazaar; the Russian resident lives in a little foreign quarter, ten miles away. Merely as a railway, Mr. Norman thinks the Trans-Caspian line is in no way extraordinary, for it presents no difficulties, the only engineering exploit being the bridge over the Oxus. What we say of the civilizing influence of England in the East is exactly what Mr. Norman says of that of Russia. Russian authority means "peace, safety, and civilization." He thinks it probable that, for the sake of getting decent government, the Bokharans may rebel against their present ruler, though just now in the capital the natives regard any foreigner with a contempt and hatred which they take little pains to hide. An out-of-the-way paper on "The Sense of Nonsense," by Carolyn Wells, collects many examples of the nonsense verse of which our day and generation has produced so much. Of course, 'Alice in Wonderland' affords the most splendid and luminous examples, but there are many others. From 'Mother Goose' to the 'Bab Ballads' there is a pleasant by-path of absurdity running along by the side of the great literary high road. George Horton has a second paper on "Modern Athens," with good illustrations. This writer gives a picture of life in Athens evidently the result of much observation. Whether intentionally or not, he conveys the impression that he is not one of those who doubt whether the Greek of to-day has any real Greek blood in his veins. At any rate, there are features of resemblance. In a population of two millions there are over eight thousand priests, and in the army there is one officer to every twelve men. There is a "modern Aristophanes" who edits a satirical weekly. Ernest C. Peixotto has an article (illustrated by himself) on Carcassonne and Albi, the former a place strangely neglected by tourists; and Mrs. Gilbert contributes the first part of her "Stage Reminiscences," which are sure to attract attention.

—It is related of Whittier by his biographer that in later life he destroyed every procurable copy of his 'Legends of New England,' published in 1831, paying even five dollars for the privilege of burning it. It is also a fact that, long before he could have any "literary remains," he carefully destroyed a mass of correspondence that might have been of much value to the historian. Both these actions savored alike of secretiveness and of repentance, and they make it probable that were he now alive he would be buying up the recent limited edition of 'Whittier as a Politician' (Boston: Charles E. Goodspeed). This thin volume, elegantly printed (with a good portrait and one facsimile) at the Riverside Press, has, as its excuse for being, a small number of hitherto unpublished letters to Elizur Wright, one of the ablest of the early abolition leaders, and, like Whittier, attached to the political movement which—with other causes—produced the memorable schism in the anti-slavery ranks in 1840. Some of this correspondence would have helped garnish a little Mr. Pickard's Life of Whittier, and supplied a date or two, but it cannot be thought of sufficient consequence to warrant a book. On the discovery of another handful of autographs, we are in danger of being treated to another volume. Mr. Pickard's annotations go but little beyond the letters, and are not free from statements concerning Whittier's relation to the purely moral anti-slavery movement likely to mislead. This is especially true of the woman question, his own share in which was as taxable with "shocking mismanagement" as was that of his political associates in Massachusetts, in Elizur Wright's own phraseology. Mr. Pickard should not have left his readers ignorant of the fact that the "woman question" was raised by those who, in Garrison's language, were for *"requiring women to be silent* in anti-slavery conventions, when their consciences demand that they should speak." That Whittier was not proud of the retrospect in this particular, is more than certain. Mr. Pickard errs in ranking Whittier and Wright as the youngest members of the convention that founded the American Anti-Slavery Society.

—The close of the century brought the concluding part, Green-Gyzzarn, of the fourth volume of the 'Oxford Dictionary' (H. Frowde), with Mr. Henry Bradley at the helm. Every page of this volume (as of every other) he gratefully acknowledges to have been enriched in particular by the "continued and unremitting labor of Mr. Fitzedward Hall, D. C. L.," with "new and valuable quotations"; and this alone would make the grand dictionary an international product, in which Americans can take their proper pride. The letter G stands apart as devoid of words with prepositional or adverbial prefixes. A few other compounds, in *gym-*, *gyn-*, *gymno-* (*gym* invariably pronounced *jim*, except in the case of the German *gymnasium*), occur at the close. Preference is given to "guerrilla" over "guerilla"; also to "grey" over "gray," as being more frequent in English use, and, in fact, it here takes the place of the latter in the alphabetic arrangement. The origin of the "grey" of "greyhound" is etymologically indeterminable. The lawyers' "greenbag," we learn, has in course of time turned blue; while Greenland's name is a *lucus a non*, being chosen by the discoverer in 986 "because it would induce settlers to go there if the land had a good name." Under "greenback" is a citation from Longfellow's Life; and whereas *Punch's* laureate, in the day of 'Hiawatha,' finding the poet's cognomen "awkward for the metre," wrote it as "Protracted Fellow," the Dictionary deems the contraction "Longf." sufficiently clear to the English-speaking world. "I guess," as an Americanism, cuts no great figure here. The section devoted to it opens with a quotation from Locke, in 1692—"Once in Four and Twenty Hours, I think, is enough; and no Body, I guess, will think it too much"—and ends with one from Howells's 'Silas Lapham.' The Dutch form of "groat" shows that the Dutch coin circulated in England before home minting began. "Grippe," a form preferred to "grip," is first met with in 1776, when " an epidemic cold seems to have spread itself from London to Barcelona. In passing through this kingdom [France], it has obtained the name of 'grippe,' a term significant enough from the nature of its attack on the throat." Noteworthy is the fact that the fine-art senses of "group" antedate all others in English—1695 (Dryden) for graphic and plastic representation, 1727 for music, 1731 for architecture, 1736 for things, 1748 for persons. FitzGerald's East Anglian nautical phrase, "to smell the ground" (of a ship that slackens speed as the water shallows under her), is not overlooked, but its metaphorical employment in the very passage quoted is not discriminated. He repeats it, with reference to his failing health, in a letter to Mrs. Kemble of October 4, 1875, and adds: "But I remain while above Ground," etc.

—We cannot pause to jubilate over the completion of volume iv., for Dr. Murray is forging ahead with volume v. (H—K), and his quarterly contribution takes him from Invalid to Jew. All the *iso-* compounds are here, and nearly as numerous as those in Greek itself; and with regard to the great suffix *-ize* we have the authoritative decision that as this suffix, whatever the element to which it is added, "is in its origin the Greek *-ιζειν*, Latin *-izare;* and as the pronunciation is also with *z*, there is no rea-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son why in English the special French spelling [*-iser*] should be followed in opposition to that which is at once etymological and phonetic." Under "irenicon" it is remarked that the *e* is short in American and some English dictionaries, but that the regular Academic pronunciation makes it long. American influence has been felt in the case of "ironclad," which in 1866 displaced the official English term for armored vessels, though it had been heard in England before our civil war. We miss Mr. Seward's proverbial "*irrepressible* conflict," which was a half-battle word in our political history. Mr. Beecher's "true inwardness" is belated by a couple of years in being cited only from the *Tribune* of April, 1877; nor is it referred to its author. Under "invention" we should have liked to see Dryden's "The first happiness of the poet's imagination is properly invention, or finding of the thought," capped by Keats's (letter to Benjamin Bailey, October 8, 1817) "Invention, which I take to be the Polar Star of Poetry, as Fancy is the Sails, and Imagination the rudder"—a triple definition worthy to be snatched by the lexicographer. The J section of our vocabulary contains no word of Old English origin except where it stands, rarely, for an earlier *ch*. A mass of exotics, it typifies admirably the glory of the English tongue in its all-embracing hospitality. The letter itself, whether capital or lower-case, does not occur in the Bible of 1611, nor in the text of the Shakspere Folio of 1623.

GENERAL COX'S MEMOIRS.

Military Reminiscences of the Civil War. By Jacob Dolson Cox, A.M., LL.D., formerly Major-General Commanding the Twenty-third Corps. Two volumes, pp. 549, 596. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900.

Of the generals of the war for the Union, none was more competent to leave behind him as a legacy to his countrymen a historic memorial of great events in which he was an active and distinguished figure than Gen. Cox, whose untimely death in midsummer last is still fresh in the minds of our readers. He was one of the small number of civilians who transferred to the military duties to which he was assigned by the Governor of Ohio at the very first outbreak of war, the habits and tastes of the scholar. These he maintained to the end of his army career with the same diligence and enthusiasm which he applied to the professional studies of peace; and his steady rise in rank, though constantly hindered by influences which pushed men to the front through considerations often quite foreign to their soldierly, intellectual, or moral desert, was attained by sheer force of ability and character. A rather unfriendly biographer (unfriendly because irritated by the spirit of independence in politics which Cox preserved) paid him the reluctant tribute of saying that he was the most many-sided man in the army; and that, on the day of his muster-out, he stood higher in the esteem of the Government and the country than he had on any previous day throughout the war.

Schofield, in recommending, in the fall of 1864, the confirmation of Cox's nomination to be Major-General, which Gen. McClellan had urged immediately after Antietam, but which had failed, for reasons involving officers like Buford, Schofield, Horatio G. Wright, and William F. Smith, said, in his praise: "I have never seen a more able and efficient division commander"; and Sherman declared him to be one of his division commanders "of marked courage, capacity, and merit, qualified to a separate command." His services covered a wide and varied field, from West Virginia to the Army of the Potomac, during the campaign of South Mountain and Antietam; from East Tennessee to Atlanta; then in the battles before Nashville, which destroyed Hood's army; and, at last, with Schofield, from Wilmington, N. C., in coöperation with Sherman's march, in time to be present at the surrender of Johnston, and to have temporary charge of the department in which the surrendered forces lingered in their sudden transition from war to peace.

Possessed of an attractive literary style, which he had shown as well in numerous pamphlets and addresses upon science and civic problems as in several monographs upon men and epochs of the civil war, he brought to these Reminiscences, the absorbing avocation of many recent years, the philosophic imagination which raises them above a bare chronicle of notable events, or a personal record chiefly pleasing to those who have shared the same experiences, and entitles them to a place among historic views of the character and conduct of our armies which enlighten and guide our countrymen for future crises of national life. In the beginning we find Cox and Garfield fellow-members of the Ohio Legislature, and room-mates, in the anxious winter of 1860-'61, when the Southern States were passing their ordinances of secession. When Sumter was fired upon, both were ready, with a deep sense of the gravity of affairs, to dedicate their powers to the coming war. They listened to an address of Stephen A. Douglas to a sober multitude gathered under the balcony of a Columbus hotel, when he cast his lot, without reservation, with the cause of the Union; and together, as they went back to their boarding-house, they discussed the probable duration and effects of that storm whose overhanging cloud appalled all witnesses. Garfield insisted that Cox was too frail of body to meet the hardships of warfare, while for himself he prophesied a capability of braving all possible privations. As it actually happened, Garfield was compelled to leave the service at the end of 1863 from constitutional physical weakness, while Cox continued to the close of the war with unfailing vigor.

Cox was already a brigadier-general of the Ohio militia, a high-sounding title with no corresponding responsibilities, for the entire organized forces of men having any familiarity with arms consisted of two or three holiday companies. But, anticipating that the rank might soon carry obligation, he had read Jomini and other military masters, in their original tongues, for he was a good linguist, and, while in command of the first assemblage of regiments at Camp Dennison, he continued his careful study of every standard treatise of the science of war upon which he could lay hold. McClellan and Rosecrans were among the first officers appointed by the sagacious Gov. Dennison, and were immediately put in charge of the Ohio volunteers; and with these, from the first, Cox kept up an intimate friendship which did not blind him, as time went on, to the peculiarities which later brought these officers to disaster.

The forces of secession were early directed into West Virginia for the purpose of holding that country of slavery-hating mountaineers to their allegiance to the Southern Confederacy. Thither Cox, under McClellan and Rosecrans, led his brigade, and there were witnessed the first exploits of several well-known commanders upon both sides—Lee, Wise, and Floyd among the Confederates; and there, too, were the first successes of the Union arms, upon whose fame, much exaggerated when the echoes of the fights reached Washington, McClellan and Rosecrans were borne to high places. Gen. Cox says of McClellan that, comparing his sonorous bulletins to the War Department with his unassuming modesty in contact with his associates in camp, he seemed two antipodal types of men. The affair of Rich Mountain, about a week before Bull Run, in which the Confederates under Garnett and Pegram were dispersed, was the direct cause, at least in popular imagination, of McClellan's summons to the command of the armies of the nation, although the combat was ill managed, and such credit as attached to the Union arms was due to the under officers, who made a long détour over mountain paths to cut off the enemy's communications; for McClellan, who had elaborately planned surrounding his adversaries, did nothing in front, and showed the same characteristics which were laid to his charge by his critics to the end of his career—the same overestimate of the enemy, the same hesitancy to throw in his whole force when he knew his subordinates were engaged.

These mountain regions were in many respects an admirable school of the green soldier, in daring, self-reliance, and patience under inevitable privations and pains; and Gen. Cox's descriptions of the adventurous life amidst some of the most imposing and picturesque scenery of the country are attractive bits of narrative. Of both this fastness of West Virginia and that of East Tennessee, in many features like it, we know of no account so adequate in showing their relation to the general conduct of the war. Sherman could see no sensible reason for supporting an army in East Tennessee—"East Tennessee is my horror!"; but the political and humane reasons which Gen. Cox sets forth with much cogency as those which actuated Lincoln in his eagerness not to leave the loyalists there to guerrilla mercies, make it evident that the war could not always be conducted upon purely military grounds. It was also a defence of the lives and liberties of the families of those who were in battle-line far from home—men who had made far greater sacrifices for patriotism than were borne by the average enlisted man.

It was while this army was yet suffering intensely from lack of rations and clothing, with most of its draught animals dead or dying, and in a period of zero cold such as at rare intervals sweeps down into the valley of the Holston, and while the Washington authorities, skeptical of there being any special difficulties in the way of winter operations, were impatiently urging upon Burnside to drive the Confederates from the country, that Grant came to the ground to observe the situation. He quickly perceived that there had been no exaggeration of the impossibilities of movement until the men were fed and clothed; but, to make sure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the entire conditions, he undertook the return journey by the way of Cumberland Gap, the weather being still bitter and the roads of the worst character. His report to Washington resulted in a respite of worrying orders from Halleck, and in vigorous steps for supplying and reinforcing the enfeebled forces. Of Burnside's conduct during this winter our author speaks with the most ardent praise. That General showed a tenacity of purpose, a fertility of resource, a magnetism over his troops, which demonstrated that, in a less depressing and exacting position than that of head of the Army of the Potomac, he had great soldierly gifts. To a vindication of Burnside's conduct at Antietam, where Cox commanded the Ninth Corps while Burnside led the left wing of the army, there is given an interesting chapter. McClellan and Burnside were upon terms of frank comradeship down to this time; and after the battle they still kept up a semblance of the old familiarity, but some malign influence caused McClellan on the morning of the battle to send to Burnside an *unsigned* reprimand of the severest sort for delays in the disposition of his corps, the day before, September 16. Gen. Burnside promptly showed that the delays had been due to specific orders of McClellan's staff. The lack of an official signature imparts to this document an element of inexplicable mystery considering its unusual and unwarranted spirit.

Cox's comments upon McClellan's conduct of this campaign are, like his judgments all through the Reminiscences, in the kindest and most judicial temper. They have especial value as the estimate of an observer who then, and for a long time after, shared the almost universal affection, bordering upon reverence, which McClellan inspired in his command. Looking over the campaign in the light of the later printed War Records, and recalling the impressions forced upon him at the time, Cox thinks it plain that McClellan displayed to an extreme his persistent infirmity, the excess of caution resembling irresolution, in not pushing the advance of his army while yet the enemy was divided, and, when the battle was hot, tardily and insufficiently reinforcing his hard beset lines when the Confederates were stripping their columns at other points to overwhelm their adversary at the point of attack. The chief paralyzing influence upon McClellan's judgment, then and through the Peninsular campaign, was that which had affected him at Rich Mountain—the extravagant exaggeration of the numbers opposing him. Other commanders learned at an early period of their experience to determine the enemy's strength by ascertaining from prisoners and deserters the names of the organizations in their front, and calculating upon the probable average numbers of such organizations the aggregate force which they had to meet. While McClellan was before Richmond in the summer of 1862, Gen. Meigs, at Washington, collating his information from newspapers and other sources, judged that Lee had about one hundred and fifty regiments, which, at the maximum field strength of each, would give him 105,000 infantry, or, at the more probable estimate, allowing for the wear and tear of service, 60,000. Gen. Webb has, since the war, compiled Lee's numbers from the official Confederate documents, and the result is between 70,000 and 80,000 infantry. But then, as at Antietam, McClellan, relying upon the worse than worthless, because often apparently malicious, misinformation of his secret-service officers, insisted that Lee had an army double his own. At the utmost, Lee at Antietam had 75,000 men—probably many less; while McClellan had 87,000. These enormous delusions as to the resistance which he must meet rendered impracticable all agreement between the General and the Administration; for, yield to his demands for reinforcements as much as the War Department would, McClellan straightway imagined a corresponding increase of his opponent's resources.

Leaving this old controversial matter which the published War Records have conclusively settled to the complete demolition of many of the reasonings in justification of the dragging operations of the Army of the Potomac in 1861-2, we turn to a most suggestive discussion of the relative merits of West Point officers and those of education among the volunteers. The impression has prevailed, and has seemed to be warranted by the fact, that the successful military leaders of the war were graduates of the Military Academy, that the West Point education was the true shaping force of the eventual suppression of the Rebellion. But the conditions of admission to the Academy were far lighter than to the average college fitting-school. Cadets like Grant, Sheridan, and a host of others entered with less than the average common-school education, for Grant had never seen an algebra till his appointment to the Academy; and the results attained after the four years' course put the graduate upon the level, as to scholarship, of a sophomore at Harvard or Yale. And in the respect of training in the command of men, even Sherman never rose during his cadetship above the rank of a sergeant, and few cadets reached a captain's place. From their graduation, the majority went to frontier posts, where they seldom saw a library, and where there was an utter absence of intellectual stimulus; therefore, no reading or discussion of scientific treatises of the conduct of armies. There is, indeed, says Gen. Cox, something of value in the habit of mind formed in actual service, even if this be on a petty scale; but, on the other hand, there was brought to the war in 1861 a temper of slavish reverence for the established usages of the old régime which made many a regular officer slow to stubbornness in recognizing the new conditions, unlike those of any previous war, which now had to be met—the inevitable improvements in tactics, in the modes of discipline, in armaments, in transportation, and in hospitals. All this learning the bright educated volunteer—and there were a great many whose abilities eventually asserted themselves for high commands in face of the not illegitimate belief at headquarters that regulars could most safely be intrusted with leadership—could as quickly acquire as the West Point graduate; often he was a much more apt and docile pupil of experience; and it was actual experience, apart from that rare native endowment which distinguishes all sorts of born leadership, which brought out the personal qualities of clear perception of the simple facts to be dealt with, the decisive will to deal with them, and the entire self-possession in critical moments of danger which are the main features of successful generalship, more important than any technical knowledge gained in the schools. As compared with Halleck, Grant was destitute of scholarship, but he had the personal qualities which made him ready, as Halleck was not, to assume responsibility when it was laid upon him; and there were scores of volunteer officers who made far more brilliant successes when the opportunity came than could have been in the power of a large portion of regulars whose names encumbered the lists of generals, to the exclusion, under the laws limiting the appointments to the highest grades, of those whom the heads of armies would have been glad to set in responsible places. Could there have been a systematic and impartial sifting of officers from time to time, among both the regulars and the volunteers, eliminating those who had plainly failed; and could the baneful influence of political intrigue with the appointing civil administrations have been prevented—such as, for example, once caused the nomination to be major-generals of two men whom Sherman had just relieved from lower commands (and the experience could undoubtedly be paralleled in other departments)—the war would have been sooner ended and its military lessons been more profitable for the illumination of students the world over. Among volunteer regiments drilled by college-bred or militia-trained officers, there were in a large number of cases as efficient troops for all occasions as any which any American or European army has ever shown. "Wherefore," concludes Gen. Cox, "I have no hesitation in adding that our army as a whole would have been improved if the distinction between regular and volunteer had been abolished, and, after the first beginnings, a freer competition to even the highest commands been open to all."

Of the Atlanta campaign and of the operations before Nashville, Gen. Cox has already written separate accounts, so that although what is here said with regard to those campaigns is full of interest, it contains less that is fresh and new than is to be found in the portions of the books to which we have especially called attention. It may be well to observe, however, that in the battle of Franklin, in November, 1864, whose conduct fell to Gen. Cox, the Confederate losses in general officers were among the greatest for any combat of the war; although, in the nation's absorption in Sherman's march to the sea and in the siege of Petersburg, the significance and bloodiness of this affair were largely lost sight of.

When Sherman was emerging from his plunge into the swamps of South Carolina, Schofield's columns (in which Cox led the Twenty-third Corps, transferred from Tennessee), marching from Wilmington, N. C., swept away the interposing Confederates, and joined Sherman at Raleigh. Here Cox witnessed the surrender of Johnston, and in this vicinity he remained for a time in command of the department, while the bewildered people were getting fitted to their new political relations. Here his soldiers had the novel business of helping to adjust domestic problems, for the freedwomen not only refused to cook for their old mistresses, but took possession, as of their own property, of the outside kitchens containing the culinary utensils, and the soldiers had to assert the rights of the lawful owners to their sole means for the preparation of meals. So, too, it was curious to notice the wondering interest with which the just discharged Confederate soldiers watched the formal and, to many of them, unwonted,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceremonies of parades and guard-mountings of the select Union regiment designated to guard the remnants of Confederate Government property. So long as the muskets, horses, and other valuables of the dying Confederacy were under their own officers, the rank and file of the Southerners felt free to help themselves; but, when placed under the care of Union sentinels, these articles were punctiliously respected.

Gen. Cox had the fortune, from first to last, to meet on terms of intimacy a large number of Union leaders, and the impressions of the characteristic excellences and defects of those who soon fell out of public regard, as well as of those who steadily grew in reputation, form one of the many attractive features of these Reminiscences. Of the most distinguished of these generals, Cox was nearest drawn to Sherman, whose acquaintance he made upon the campaign to Atlanta, but whose deeper nature he learned to appreciate in the painful period of the controversy with Stanton and Halleck, over his settlement of the terms of surrender with Johnston. Of Sherman, Cox wrote: "In him the combination of intellectual insight with fertility of invention, and with force of will in execution, was of the highest order, and I soon acquired an undoubting conviction that of all men I had met he was the one to whose leadership in war I would commit my own life and the lives of my men with complete confidence."

RECENT ANTHOLOGIES, AT HOME AND ABROAD.

Mr. Quiller-Couch's 'Oxford Book of English Verse, 1250 to 1900' (Frowde), is one of those books, always rather exasperating to Americans, in which an English compiler well read in the poetry of his own land is gracious enough to include a few samples of the poetry of other lands of which he knows very little. Such mixed anthologies, where they are necessary, can be best prepared by Americans, for the obvious reason that cultivated Americans habitually know something of England by personal observation, whereas few among cultivated Englishmen have ever set eyes on America. Genius is, of course, universal in its quality, but since the atmosphere of poetry is largely local, it follows that the types of character and influences of external nature belonging to a foreign country cannot be known as a reader knows his own land; and the untravelled stranger often misses the finest and profoundest qualities of the poetry he professes to judge, and fails to be impressed by what should teach him most. Hence we find Mr. Quiller-Couch, a faithful lecturer on classics at Oxford, and a good yachtsman, publishing a book of English verse which has twice as many selections from Wilfred Scawen Blunt as from Ralph Waldo Emerson; and which tranquilly offers us two poems by Richard Le Gallienne, set against one each by Longfellow and Whittier, and none by Lowell or Holmes. For the English part of the anthology—which is, of course, under such conditions, the substantial and important part—this manual is as good as other such books, perhaps better; and at any rate far surpasses the second volume of Palgrave's 'Golden Treasury,' which was so sad a falling off from the first, but in which, it will be remembered, Palgrave was wise enough to abandon his original project of including American poets.

A book of incomparably more thought and seriousness than that of Mr. Quiller-Couch is 'A Treasury of Irish Poetry in the English Tongue,' edited by Stopford A. Brooke and T. W. Rolleston (Macmillan). Here, it is to be observed, we have in the very title a recognition that there may be poetry in the English tongue outside of the English nation. Even as to this book, we have, from the American point of view, some local criticism to offer, since the editors make no mention, among previous Irish anthologies, of that of Connolly (New York, 1887), which is the largest yet printed, although not the most critical in tone. What is quite surprising is that the book should absolutely omit all mention of Boyle O'Reilly, a fact the more remarkable as it includes his friend and fellow-Fenian, Richard Dwyer Joyce, who resided, like O'Reilly, in Boston, and published his own poems first in America, where he was, however, far less known and less popular than his friend. Even Mr. Quiller-Couch has room for O'Reilly, though he naturally prints his name wrong, giving it as Boyd instead of Boyle. A few special omissions also surprise us in this Irish anthology, as that of Thomas Davis's "Ballad of Fontenoy," of the fine poem of "Avondu" by Callanan, and of two superb ballads of "The Seven Whistlers" and "The Doom-Bar" by Alice E. Gillington, included in Mrs. Sharp's 'Lyra Celtica.' Nor can we quite approve the slighting way in which the editors speak of Father Prout's "Bells of Shandon," which is a bit of singular natural melody, and especially dear to every American who has listened for those chimes while sailing up from Queenstown to Cork on "the pleasant waters of the River Lee."

The present work gives less than some other collections in the way of the very earliest Irish poetry, yet it goes back to Callanan and Drennan, and comes down to the latest contemporary writers, of course including that fine poet Yeats, and not forgetting Mr. A. P. Graves, of whom a capital story is told (p. 380). He was once informed, it seems, by a young man at a London club that there was no one now living who could write really good and racy Irish songs, "such songs, for instance, as 'Father O'Flynn,'" a song which happened to have been written by Mr. Graves himself. It is one, by the way, which will always seem delightful to any one who has heard it sung by a cheery and mellow-voiced Irish priest. It is only Irish humor, after all, that can rise to the very heights of fun without a word of coarseness. This, and all the other Irish traits, are worked out with exquisite refinement of criticism in this work by a variety of critics, of whom Yeats is easily the best, and who leave the lover of really ideal poetry in the renewed conviction that it is Ireland, and not England, which represents, in song, the pure imagination and even the spiritual life.

That American poetry can be well handled in a foreign land, when not mixed with any other verse, is well vindicated by the new and enlarged edition of 'The Treasury of American Sacred Song,' by the Rev. William Garrett Horder (Frowde). This book affords on the whole a manual better fulfilling its purpose than any American work of the kind, and all the more from the fact that it is not a mere hymn-book, but simply a collection of serious and thoughtful verse, selected with singular felicity and annotated with remarkable correctness. Mr. Horder is, it is understood, a dissenting minister in the suburbs of London, and he has had the active coöperation of the Rev. Richard Wilton, rector of Londesborough and canon of York, who furnishes a prefatory sonnet for the book, thus bringing it in a manner into undoubted ecclesiastical society.

'Poets and Poetry of Indiana, 1800 to 1900,' compiled by Benjamin S. Parker and Enos B. Heiney (Silver, Burdett & Co.), is an honest and only too miscellaneous collection of poems from that Western State which claims for itself a larger proportion of authors than any other. There is, of course, a good deal of commonplace in the book; it includes a great many of those elementary forms of verse in which the same jingling line constantly recurs, often closing with some ringing or pensive personal name, as Ben Bolt or Lily Dale. Other poems tend inevitably to the Poesque form, where the close of the verse duplicates itself with what Poe was wont to dignify as a repetend. The biographical notes are pitched on that scale of exaggeration which describes 'Ben Hur' as a work of genius, and its author as "one of the most splendid figures of our epoch"; yet a State may justly be proud which claims for itself the talent of James Whitcomb Riley, Forceythe Wilson, Maurice Thompson, Robert Underwood Johnson, and John Hay. The world may be relied upon to effect the needed work of repression wherever fame is exaggerated, and, moreover, this book introduces some comparatively new poets, such as Evaleen Stein, whose fine poem of "The Marshes" (p. 204) would alone be enough to make a reputation.

An admirable book of selections is the 'Anthology of French Poetry' (tenth to nineteenth centuries), by Henry Carrington, M.A., Dean of Bocking (Frowde). It is rare to find in an Englishman that delicacy of touch which can translate a French lyric poem, and it is vain to pretend that the verses of Victor Hugo and Béranger do not lose a great deal in Dean Carrington's hands. His translations are not, for instance, nearly so good as those of Longfellow, who certainly had a very exceptional gift in that direction; and we have seen much better manuscript versions of his twelfth-century authors. This is one of his neatest and best, from a rondel by Charles d'Orléans (p. 74):

Shall it be so?
Shall I be thine?
Strife I resign
On bended knee.

To this one plea
Thine ear incline;
Shall it so be?
Shall I be thine?

Envy may see
My faith I plight,
My dear delight;
Let us agree;
Shall it so be?
Shall I be thine?

'Lullabys [*sic*] and Baby Songs,' collected by Adelaide L. J. Gosset (Dutton), contains a fairly good selection, including many unfamiliar poems, chiefly from Irish sources; the only American contribution being Eugene Field's "Garden and Cradle." The illustrations, by Eva Roos, are commonly good, so far as the babies' faces are concerned, but are in other respects unfortunate, the mothers usually looking dismal rather than joyous, and the angels' wings in the frontispiece having the air of fashionable winter wraps.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democracy and Empire. With Studies of their Psychological, Economic, and Moral Foundations. By Franklin Henry Giddings. Macmillan. 1900. Pp. x, 363.

Professor Giddings has thought it well to remind his readers that the papers collected in the present volume are not miscellaneous contributions, but "logically related parts of a whole"; but we fear that most of those who go through the book will have difficulty in recognizing the unity which the author asserts exists. 'Democracy and Empire' is a volume of papers and addresses on a considerable variety of social, economic, and political subjects, ranging from "The Psychology of Society," "The Ethical Motive," "The Costs of Progress," and "Industrial Democracy," to "Public Revenue and Civic Virtue," "The Shadow and Substance of Republican Government," and "Some Results of the Freedom of Women." So far as the title of the volume is concerned, the only papers which seem to bear very directly upon it, or, indeed, to give it much point, are those on "The Democratic Empire," "The Destinies of Democracy," "Imperialism," and "The Ideals of Nations." Most of the papers have already seen the light, either in print or on the platform.

While the somewhat miscellaneous contents of Professor Giddings's book makes any detailed discussion of it impracticable, it seems fair to take the author at his word, and assume that it is the idea suggested by the title which he wishes particularly to impress. Whatever else the volume is or is not, it is certain to be regarded, and has indeed already been heralded, as in large part a defence of "expansion," though not, of course, of Expansion solely in the restricted sense in which the term has lately come to be used in this country. What Professor Giddings would show is that democracy, in the broad sense of the word, is, from its nature, bound to spread more and more in the world, and that a democratic state must expect to see its boundaries enlarging, and the sphere of its influence widening, with the lapse of years. "Empire," in the broad and general sense, democracy is bound to usher in, and to oppose or bewail the fact is only to put one's self in unintelligent and unavailing opposition to natural law. Democracy, to be sure, is ever changing its external aspect, as it absorbs the various influences, political, economic, and social, which from time to time arise; but to possess the earth, to establish itself as the ultimate type of national life, is its constant trend. There are dangers, of course—among them, and much the most important, being popular ignorance and indifference, economic greed, political corruption, and unwise legislation; but the heart of democracy is sound, and its aims must in the end prevail.

If we ask as to the precise nature of this democracy which is to wax more and more, we are told that its essential characteristic is "ethical likemindedness." Ethical likemindedness, according to Professor Giddings,

"consists in a common loyalty to the common judgment and will, in a common willingness to share a common destiny, and in a common conviction of the priceless value of individual, religious, and local liberty. Given mental and moral agreement in these particulars, and a nation of any territorial extent, of any admixture of blood, of interests, of religions, can wax strong, generation by generation, while yet becoming more free and more diversified in its social organization" (pp. 10, 11).

It is by this principle that we are to explain "the wonderful phenomenon of the democratic empire." There follows as a corollary the further proposition—

"that, when a nation makes itself the nucleus of an empire, step by step extending its sway over distant lands and peoples successively annexed, it can continue to be democratic; it can become, decade after decade, more democratic; it can even permit its colonies or dependencies to be democratic, while at the same time maintaining a strong imperial government for purposes of a common defence; all on the one inviolable condition that, *as it lengthens the reach of government, it must curtail the functions of government.* The small local community, homogeneous in nearly every respect—in blood, in traditions, in beliefs, in interests—may successfully conduct a local or municipal government of highly diversified functions. . . . But a national government, if it would respect liberty while maintaining political cohesion, must leave most of these functions to local communities or to voluntary enterprise. An imperial government must be yet more general, if it is not to suppress freedom and the democratic spirit. It must confine itself practically to three things, namely: the imperial defence, the suppression of conflict between one part of the empire and another, and insistence that local administration shall come up to a certain standard in its protection of life and property, and in its respect for enlightenment. Doing these things and only these, it can leave each component part of the empire to evolve its own law and its own administration in its own way—to become, in short, as democratic as the spirit and the experience of the people will permit" (p. 11).

We have given space to the foregoing passages because they contain, in concise and forcible language, the proposition around which Professor Giddings has evidently intended to construct his book. As to the theory therein propounded, we make a single observation. While "ethical likemindedness" is an obvious prerequisite of a well-knit state, the practical questions of "empire" are of a different sort. It is the diversity of material interests, and the differing degrees of civilization, which test the wisdom and skill of rulers, and test it the more because these divergencies of standard may exist coincidently with much "ethical likemindedness." "Common loyalty to the common judgment and will," too, easy enough of attainment within narrow territorial limits, is a very different matter when applied to the empires known to history, if for no other reason than the practical impossibility of getting, save in times of crisis, any clear expression of the "common judgment and will." The trouble, as it seems to us, lies in theorizing about a democratic empire as one would theorize about a relatively small and homogeneous community, and forgetting the disturbance which increased area, unequal civilization, diversity of material interests, and especially love of political freedom have never failed to introduce.

Those who, whether attracted to the theoretical presentation or not, look to Professor Giddings's book for clear light on our present national perplexities, are likely, we fear, to have some difficulty in finding it. There is plenty of keen observation as to what a democratic people ought in general to do, but the clinching application to our own day is wanting. Professor Giddings does little to counteract the notion that empire, in the conventional sense of rule over subject or dependent people, is what the world not only is coming to, but ought to come to. The function of weak races in the development of civilization is a subject to which he, in common with most students of sociology, pays scant attention. He is convinced—as who is not?—that a superior civilization is bound to triumph over an inferior one, and that the nation which cannot maintain itself in the struggle for survival must go to the wall; but he is not equally decided in pointing out how often the course of empire has been marked out by greed and selfishness, paved with sounding phrases and pious ejaculations, and strewn with the remains of shattered political morality. We could certainly wish that Professor Giddings—than whom no American scholar has thought more persistently along these lines—had found room in his pages for some very clear and specific warning against the false notion of national progress which is now being flaunted in the faces of honest and intelligent American citizens, and for protest against parading our recent achievements as though there were something sacred and Providential about them.

The reason for this lack is partly to be found, we think, in a characteristic of Professor Giddings's thinking, which reviewers of his earlier writings have already pointed out. With all his painstakingness and wealth of orderly information, he does not constantly keep his feet on the earth. Accepting the doctrine that sociology is merely a description of society, he is, nevertheless, prone to wander off into the cloudland of philosophical speculation. What he has to say in these flights is often, where one can feel reasonably sure of having grasped it, highly stimulating and suggestive; but to most readers it must be undeniably vague. On the other hand, Professor Giddings has in a high degree the gift of style, and is able to present the fruits of his studies in singularly attractive dress; and most of the papers in 'Democracy and Empire' are likely, by their literary qualities, to delight many readers whose net impression of their significance will be somewhat dim.

Le Règne de Louis IV. d'Outre-Mer. Par Ph. Lauer. [Le 127e fascicule de la Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes-Études.] Paris: Émile Bouillon. 1900.

The aim of M. Lauer in this study of the later Carolingian period is to determine the bare facts which can be accepted with confidence. The difficulties of the case are twofold. In the first place, the authorities are meagre; and, secondly, the historians of our own century have written in a tone of confidence where they should have used extreme caution. Among contemporary annalists, M. Lauer assigns the highest rank to Flodoard of Reims, who, apart from historical composition, is known to mediævalists as the most copious Latin poet of the tenth century. The four books of Richer's History, discovered by Pertz in 1833, have been freely used by recent students, but M. Lauer considers that they possess little independent weight. He holds a poor opinion, also, of Rodulfus Glaber and Dudo of St. Quentin. His main source is Flodoard, and if he gleans isolated statements from a wide range of literature and charters, he seldom strays far from the pages of the priest of Reims. In a bibliography of over two hundred titles the one authority may be said to balance all the rest.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Un grand nombre de faits ne nous sont connus que par les Annales [de Flodoard], et, sans les indications sûres qu'on y trouve, une histoire du règne de Louis d'Outre-Mer ne consisterait guère que dans un tissu de légendes."

While the body of genuine information is thus meagre, modern knowledge has been vitiated by the careless and rash dogmatism of celebrated authors like Thierry, Michelet, and Guizot. Thierry, the worst sinner of the three, was guilty of errors in his 'Lettres sur l'Histoire de France' which have been followed ever since. For instance, he sees in Hugues le Grand, the leader of the nobles against Louis d'Outre-Mer, a champion of national sentiment against Germany, whereas that prince showed the utmost readiness to join Otto I. whenever such a combination would weaken Louis, his own suzerain. Hugues even went the length of making himself the vassal of Otto, and put all northern France under German control. Guizot, too, has erred in exalting the patriotism of the Robertian duke at this juncture. M. Lauer has found much to decipher and much to rectify.

The reign of Louis d'Outre-Mer has at least a double interest: that which springs from the problem of the king's character when taken as representative of the expiring Carolingian line, and that which centres around the contest between crown and nobles. The struggle of Louis with his feudatories may at first sight seem like other phases of a well-known mediæval condition, but it gains distinction from the period in which it was waged. In the ninth century the great states of modern Europe were shaped, and accordingly the efforts of the crown in the tenth century to maintain a dignified position may be connected with the dawning of national self-consciousness. Royalty, despite its imperfect resources, represented the desire for racial union which triumphant feudalism could not altogether destroy. During the age of Louis d'Outre-Mer the vassals on the whole had the best of the duel, although the Church pronounced excommunication against Hugues le Grand. But the institution of monarchy survived, and maintained the continuity of its claims.

Almost every one of the Carolingian kings or emperors had his nickname, and that of Louis IV. is the most picturesque. Similarly, his career contains the elements of novelty, adventure, and strife against tremendous odds. M. Lauer has given a brief epitome of his position when brought from the court of Athelstan, and a criticism of the manner in which he acquitted himself: "Fils d'un roi qui était mort en prison, il est rapellé, à quinze ans, de l'étranger, où il a été emmené par sa mère fugitive. A dix-huit ans il entreprend la conquête de la Lorraine. A dix-neuf ans il tient tête à une ligue formidable composée des plus puissants seigneurs de France et du roi de Germanie. Il a comme adversaires: Hugues le Grand, duc de France, Herbert II., comte de Vermandois, le geôlier de son pere, Arnould le Vieux ou le Grand, le 'riche' marquis de Flandre, Guillaume de Longue-Épée, duc de Normandie, et enfin Otton Ier le Grand, roi de Germanie, plus tard empereur." It is no paradox that the later Carolingians were made of far better stuff than the later Merovingians, but the researches of M. Lauer confirm one's admiration of that wonderful line which for three centuries, from the battle of Testry to the accession of Hugh Capet, remained at the head of all families in western Europe. As for Louis d'Outre-Mer, he not only did the best which it was possible to do for the kingdom of Laon, but he actually preserved the political existence of the Carolingians for fifty years, transmitting the monarchy to his son in a considerably improved condition.

M. Lauer's essay has won him the diploma of the École des Hautes-Études, with the official approval of a board which consisted of the lamented Arthur Giry, MM. G. Monod and F. Lot. It is a bit of faithful investigation, and will in no way lower the reputation of the learned series to which it belongs.

The Biography of a Baby. Millicent W. Shinn. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1900.

It would be hard to find, among the wealth of books that the Christmas season brought, one more charming than this biography of a baby. Miss Shinn has already published a series of memoirs giving in strictly scientific form the results of her year-long study of her sister's child—a contribution to the subject which is exceeded in importance by none of the numerous volumes on infant psychology that have in late years seen the light. But in this book Miss Shinn has thrown away the scientific style, and started in afresh to work up her material in literary form. In this task she has succeeded in a remarkable degree; the book is a good example of the extent to which pure science can be subjugated to the uses of the plain man—or woman—who must have literary charm to sugar-coat his pill of knowledge.

The book is full of very acute observations, and exhibits a real genius in interpreting all the signs of the baby's slowly developing mental life. The plot of it, as Miss Shinn says at the beginning, turns mainly upon the formation of the two great associations—that of the muscle sense (or sense of motion) with sight, and that of the muscle sense with touch; and again of the recombination of these pairs with each other. A particularly interesting and illuminating chapter is that devoted to the first dawning of the function of speech. For months the child had been pouring out strings of meaningless syllables, in joy or sorrow, with countless inflections and changes—such intelligent remarks as "Ne-ne-oom-boo," "Ga-boo-ng"—and certain favored syllables over and over, such as "Dă-dă-dă." At the end of the tenth month her watchers began to suspect that there was a faint consistency in the use of several of the sounds; it began to seem that something like "Dă!" was often uttered when the little one threw out her hand in pointing, or exulted in getting to her feet; that "Nă-nă-nă" was separating itself out as a wail of unwillingness and protest, and "Mă-mă-mă! as a whimper of discontent and loneliness and desire of attention, while a favorite old murmur of "M-gm" or "Ng-gng" recurred so often when something disappeared from sight that it seemed to be very like an echo of the phrase frequently heard, "All gone!"

"Week by week the note-book showed 'Dă!' growing into the regular expression of discovering and pointing out; 'Nă-nă-nă' into that of refusal; 'Mă-mă-mă,' which soon became 'Mom-mom-mom,' into that of a special sort of wanting which slowly gathered itself about the mother in particular; and 'M-gâ' or 'Gng,' used as loosely as it was pronounced, for all sorts of disappearances, absences, failures. The idea of disappearance—of the thing now seen, now gone—seems to take strong hold on babies very early. I have known [besides that of Preyer's boy] several other cases. . . . In all this we see quite clearly the first steps in language-making. I do not think that these first words were echoes of our words 'There!' and 'No!' and 'mamma'; it was only slowly, and after the baby was a year old, that they came into unison with these words of ours. It is more likely that we have here a natural cry of pointing out, a natural negative, a natural expression of baby need and dependence, which give us a hint of the origin of our own words. . . .

"The baby begins slowly to turn some of his commonest chattering sounds to special uses—not to carry thought to other people, but as mere exclamations to relieve his own mind. It was just twice within her first year that our baby turned to me when some one left the room, looked in my face and said, 'Gong!' At all other times it was simply murmured to herself. And most of the exclamations express a mood rather than a real idea; they are half way between mere cries and words proper. Even when there is plainly an idea, as in 'All gone,' it is a big vague blur of an idea, slowly taking form in the little mind, as the blurs of light and dark slowly outlined themselves into objects before the little eyes months before."

For the right bringing up of the baby there is the constant admonition that it must be allowed to handle and to tumble about countless sorts of things; that its ceaseless activities must not be thwarted; that "goodness" does not consist, for it, as the mother too often thinks, in letting things alone. The function of a grandmother, who has leisure and patience to guide the baby, safe from injury, through its tireless, perilous investigation, is of great importance. But, in fine, this is a book which, whether for pleasure or for profit, no mother—and no psychologist—can afford to be without.

Squirrels and Other Fur-bearers. By John Burroughs. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 12mo, pp. 149, illustrated.

Mr. Burroughs is an essayist rather than a naturalist, yet anything he writes on natural history is sure to be interesting. One thoroughly enjoys reading about his animals even though never quite able to banish the feeling that they have not told what they should, that they are at a distance, out of the window, off on the hillside, up in the tall trees, or down in the deep holes, while their doings are being traced in the study, on the porch, or in the hammock. The other fur-bearers are woodchucks, hares, muskrats, skunks, foxes, weasels, raccoons, porcupines, opossums, and mice. All are illustrated in somewhat high colors after Audubon. To some extent the author's methods of study are indicated by his questions regarding birds: whether they have an extra sense that we have not, or how do they manage to act as by a single impulse when the flock is started or is soaring aloft? Closer to the keen-witted children of nature, he might have seen that the alertness and quickness in following prey serve equally well to keep distance, direction, and rate with the other members of the flock; he might have heard the signals, hardly more than whispers, that start the covey, as one bird, like an explosion into the air, and change the course as it flies. Possibly other senses of the author are in keeping with that which could not detect the odor of the opossum, or was not affected by a scent of hare, opossum, and skunk under the study

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

floor. The chapter on the "Rabbit and the Hare" recalls the fact that the rabbit properly so called is a native of Europe, from North Africa to Scotland, introduced in the Falklands and in Australia, while the species called rabbit by this author is probably one of the cottontails, more of a hare than a rabbit. The "life of fear" many animals are supposed to lead is in all likelihood no more distressing than that of many human beings who profess to enjoy ill health, or who are ever on the lookout for danger from accident or design, from what they breathe, drink, eat, or wear, from indigestion, rheumatism, colds, and fevers, from the malignant germs of all the known diseases, the terrible burglar lying in wait to chloroform, strangle, club, stab, and shoot, or from ghosts.

The World of the Great Forest: How Animals, Birds, Reptiles, Insects Talk, Think, Work, and Live. By Paul Du Chaillu. Charles Scribner's Sons. 8vo, pp. 323, illustrated.

An improvement in the subtitle of this volume may be made by the substitution of mammals for the word animals. Whether relating to the more easily observed or the more difficult and rare, from the limits of the book it should not be expected that the notices are at all complete. Some are very short, others are longer, none of them long enough, yet together they give a tolerably fair impression of the inside life of the region. Evidence is abundant that the notes were gathered at first hand, in the woods, by the author. In greater part the insects, reptiles, birds, and mammals (the last including species of the pangolin, porcupine, ichneumon, civet, gazelle, wild boar, leopard, jackal, hippopotamus, elephant, monkey, ape, gorilla, and a race of the dwarf human beings) are made to do the talking, and it is through their conversations we are informed of their thoughts and habits as understood by our present authority. They are introduced by their aboriginal names, and to avoid confusion the English name is added. Scientific names would have much enhanced the value. A few of the stories suffer so from incompleteness as to give wrong ideas. Probably in making the story of the wasp and the spider the observations were not carried far enough; the wasp is said to have bitten at the back of the spider's neck until the prey seemed benumbed, when the legs were bitten off and the body carried away to be eaten at leisure. No mention of stinging is made, but by the wasps we know the prey is usually stung in one of the nerve centres, and, thus stupefied, is carried off to be stowed in the nests with the eggs as food for the young. In the case of the "Ipi, or giant Ant-eater," a pangolin or manis, one of the scaly ant-eaters, one might conclude that the claws are used only in construction of the burrow, and that the prey was of ants found running about on foraging expeditions; but the more common idea is that the manidæ use their strong claws to tear open the nests and runways of the insects as well as to make the retreat. A chapter on the well-known Johanna, a "nshiego," one of the chimpanzees, and Ntchiko, a "nkengo," one of the apes, follows that on the "obongos, or dwarfs." Originality of matter and peculiarities of style contribute to make this work effective and easy to remember.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

An English Miscellany: Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honor of his Seventy-fifth Birthday. Henry Frowde. 21s.
Bailey, L. H. The Principles of Vegetable-Gardening. Macmillan. $1.25.
Chefs-d'œuvre of the Exposition Universelle. Parts 8 and 9. Philadelphia: George Barrie & Son. $1 each.
Dasent, G. W. The Story of Burnt Njal: From the Icelandic of the Njals Saga. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.50.
Eddy, A. J. The Law of Combinations. 2 vols. Chicago: Callaghan & Co.
Hallam, Julia C. The Story of a European Tour. Sioux City (Iowa): Perkins Bros. Co.
Hort, F. J. A. Sermons on the Books of the Bible. Macmillan. $1.
Jackson, S. M. Huldreich Zwingli: The Reformer of German Switzerland. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
James, Henry. The Sacred Fount. Scribners. $1.50.
La Lande de Calan, Vicomte Ch. de. Les Personnages de l'Epopée Romane. Redon: Imprimeries Réunies A. Bouteloup. 5 francs.
Marie, Rose. How to Enjoy Matrimony. Abbey Press. 25c.
Nash, Vaughan. The Great Famine and its Causes. Longmans, Green & Co.
Peloubet, F. N. The Teachers' Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Henry Frowde.
Roberts, W. C. Wings of the Morning. G. P. Putnam's Sons.
Schuyler, Eugene. Italian Influences. Scribners. $2.50.
Schuyler, Eugene. Selected Essays. With a Memoir by Evelyn Schuyler Schaeffer. Scribners.
The Private Life of King Edward VII. By a Member of the Royal Household. D. Appleton & Co. $1.50.
Wall, A. H. A Concise French Grammar. Henry Frowde. 4s. 6d.

JUST PUBLISHED.

Johnston's High School History of the United States

With Maps, Plans and Illustrations. Being a revision of the author's "History of the United States for Schools." Revised and continued by Prof. WILLIAM MACDONALD of Bowdoin. xvii-612 pp., 12mo, $1.25 *net*.

The present volume has been brought through the Spanish War to McKinley's second election in 1900 and materially enlarged. As far as practicable the late Prof. Johnston's text has been preserved, and great care has been taken to maintain in all new matter the characteristics and principles of his original book. Political matters and the account of the Colonial period have been expanded. Each chapter has been supplied with topics for further study, and with a brief bibliography, supplemented by critical comments. Many of the maps have been taken over from the *Shorter History*, and nearly all the portraits are new. According to the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements of the National Educational Association, which tabulates the returns from 65 colleges, "selected (*a*) to cover all sections of the country, (*b*) to include all types," 23 colleges specify text-books in United States History. Out of this number 20 colleges (including Harvard, Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Vassar, and the State Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, and Ohio) recommend "Johnston's History of the United States for Schools," and it is named *exclusively* four times as often as any other.

Henry Holt & Co., 29 West 23d Street, NEW YORK
378 Wabash Avenue, CHICAGO

The Most Charming Love Story of the Year

SEVENTIETH THOUSAND.

The Cardinal's Snuff-Box

By HENRY HARLAND, author of "Comedies and Errors," "Grey Roses," etc.

Crown, 8vo. Cloth, $1 50.

The North American—"This charming love story."
New York Tribune—"So captivating, so good, that we want it to be perfect. . . . It is a book to enjoy and to praise."
Boston Herald—"One of the most refreshing love stories of modern fiction."

JOHN LANE, 251 5th Ave., New York

J. M. BARRIE AND HIS BOOKS.
By J. M. HAMMERTON.
Royal 8vo with portrait, $2.00 net.
M. F. MANSFIELD & CO., 14 W. 22d St., New York

ABYSSINIA

Through the Lion-Land to the Court of the Lion of Judah.

By HERBERT VIVIAN, M.A.,
Author of "Servia: The Poor Man's Paradise," "Tunisia, and the Modern Barbary Pirates," etc.
With 79 Illustrations and 2 Maps. 8vo, pp. xvi-342. $4.00.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
91-93 Fifth Avenue, New York.

LORDS of the NORTH
A. C. LAUT.
All Booksellers. Cloth, 8vo, $1.50.
"We have no hesitation in pronouncing it a better book than either *Janice Meredith* or *Richard Carvel*, and more acceptable than *To Have and To Hold*."—*Christian Nation.*

J. F. TAYLOR & CO. New York

WHAT THEY SAY OF
CONCERNING CHILDREN
BY
Charlotte Perkins (Stetson) Gilman,
author of "Women and Economics."

The New York Times says:
"Wanted, a philanthropist to give a copy to every English speaking parent!"

The New York Mail and Express says:
"One of the most helpful books we have yet seen."

The New York Press says:
"Should be read by every mother in the land."

The Outlook says:
"Every parent ought to read this book."

The Philadelphia Public Ledger says:
"A wonderful amount of common-sense philosophy."

The Boston Advertiser says:
"We would like to quote pages of this book, or, better still, convince the reader that the best course is to read the work from cover to cover."

YOUR BOOKSELLER HAS IT.
Price $1.25.

SMALL, MAYNARD & CO., Publishers,
BOSTON.

THE OXFORD BOOK of ENGLISH VERSE
1250-1900. Edited by A. T. QUILLER-COUCH.
Crown 8vo, gilt top, $1.90. Extra f'cap, 8vo, India paper, gilt edges, $2.60.
For Sale by all Booksellers.
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS,
American Branch, 91 & 93 Fifth Ave., N.Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Houghton, Mifflin & Co.'s New Books

THE NEW EPOCH FOR FAITH

By GEORGE A. GORDON, D.D., author of "The Christ of To-Day," "The Witness to Immortality," etc. 12mo, $1.50.

This book is an uncommonly fresh and valid contribution to the best kind of modern religious literature. It is an interpretation of the religious conditions of to-day from the point of view of a progressive thinker. Dr. Gordon assumes as clearly true that the direction of religious development for the past twenty years has been toward a freer and fuller faith. His work, while carefully discriminating, is nobly optimistic, and is written with remarkable literary power and charm.

JONATHAN EDWARDS

A Retrospect: being the Addresses delivered in connection with the Unveiling of a Memorial in the First Church of Christ in Northampton, Massachusetts, on the 150th anniversary of his dismissal from the pastorate of that Church. Edited by H. NORMAN GARDINER, Professor of Philosophy in Smith College, Chairman of Edwards Memorial Committee. With portraits of Edwards and his Wife, and a picture of the Tablet representing Edwards as preaching. 12mo, $1.25.

This book includes Addresses by Prof. A. V. G. Allen of Cambridge, Prof. Egbert C. Smyth of Andover, Rev. Dr. Gordon of Boston, Rev. Dr. Rose of Northampton, and Prof. Gardiner, the editor.

SAM LOVEL'S BOY

By ROWLAND E. ROBINSON, author of "Uncle Lisha's Outing," "A Danvis Pioneer," etc. 16mo, $1.25.

Sam Lovel is a well-known hero of Mr. Robinson's. The present story tells of his son from the time when Gran'ther Hill assisted at naming him until he entered the Union army. It describes how Uncle Lisha initiated him into the mysteries of Nature-lore and trained him to fish and hunt. The story is very well told and is full of humor.

RIVERSIDE BIOGRAPHICAL SERIES

Peter Cooper
By ROSSITER W. RAYMOND.

Thomas Jefferson
By HENRY C. MERWIN.

William Penn
By GEORGE HODGES, D.D.

Each 16mo, with photogravure portrait, 75 cents; *School Edition*, with half-tone portrait, 50 cents, *net*.

Sold by all Booksellers. Sent, postpaid, by

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON
11 EAST 17TH STREET, NEW YORK

Registered Trade Mark.

Plain White
Wash Fabrics
of
Linen, Cotton, and Silk.

All the different weights from the finest linen Lawn to the heavy Ducks are well represented. The variety is larger in every way than ever before.

Among them are:

Madras cloths,	**Victoria Lawns,**
Swisses,	**Persian Lawns,**
Linen Lawns,	**Nainsooks,**
India Linons,	**India Dimities,**
Cheviots,	**Piqués, Ducks,**

and other Fancy Cottons.

Our assortment of colored wash fabrics, including Madras Cloths, Percales, Grenadines, Zephyrs, Ginghams, etc., is equally complete and inviting.

In connection with our Wash Dress Goods Department, we have just opened a bright new stock of Edgings, Insertions, Beadings, and Allovers.

Mail orders will have prompt attention

"The Linen Store."

James McCutcheon & Co.
14 West 23d St., N. Y.

FIFTEENTH THOUSAND.

HEROD

A Tragedy in Three Acts.

By STEPHEN PHILLIPS,

Author of "Paola and Francesca."

Crown 8vo. Cloth. Price, $1.50.

LONDON TIMES: "Here is a notable work of dramatic imagination; dealing greatly with great passions; multi-colored and exquisitely musical."

POEMS. By Stephen Phillips. $1.50.
PAOLA and FRANCESCA. By Stephen Phillips. $1.25.
MARPESSA. By Stephen Phillips. 50 cents. Leather, 75 cents.

JOHN LANE, 251 Fifth Ave., New York

"The most American story I ever read."
—A CORRESPONDENT.

The Darlingtons,

An American Novel,

By ELMORE ELLIOTT PEAKE.

Published (Cloth, 12mo, $1.50) by

McCLURE, PHILLIPS & CO., New York

"A Sane Book on Trusts."
—Chicago Eve. Post.

THE TRUSTS

By Hon. WILLIAM MILLER COLLIER.

12mo, 348 pages, Cloth, $1.25; Paper, 50 cts.

"The book is of very great value. Its facts are carefully collected and arranged, and its arguments clear, pointed and convincing. It is without doubt the best analysis of the entire situation that has been made."
—*Chicago Inter Ocean.*

Mailed, postpaid, on receipt of price, by

The Baker & Taylor Co.
PUBLISHERS,
5 and 7 East Sixteenth St., New York.

Reading Case for the Nation,

To receive the current numbers in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with *The Nation* stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of 75 cents.

Arnold Constable & Co.

Woolen Dress Fabrics.

Plain and Fancy Crêpes, Silk and Wool Barèges, Veilings, Silk Warp Henriettas, Mousseline, Taffetas.

Thin Dress Fabrics

for House and Evening Wear.

Silk and Wool and All Wool Tissues.

New Colorings.

Broadway & 19th st.

NEW YORK.

REMINGTON
Standard Typewriter
327 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED